Vol. 1, No. 2 Winter 2001

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**EDITOR'S NOTE**

Glayde Whitney (1939-2002) R.I.P. *TOQ* Editors 3

**ARTICLES**

The Case for Pearl Harbor Revisionism Steve Sniegoski 5

The Western Contribution to World History James C. Russell 47

**BOOK REVIEWS**

*The 'Jewish Threat': Anti-Semitic Politics of the U.S. Army* Kevin MacDonald 65

*Dreamer of the Day: Francis Parker Yockey & the Postwar Fascist International* Theodore J. O'Keefe 79

*The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual & Political Movements* Hugh Perry 85

*The Emperor's New Clothes: Biological Theories of Race at the Millennium* Glayde Whitney 93

About the Editors 109

Editorial Advisory Board 110

*The Occidental Quarterly* (ISSN 1539-3925), a journal of Western thought and opinion, is published four times annually in the Spring, Summer, Fall, and Winter. Unsolicited manuscripts from contributing authors should be submitted to the editorial department: P.O. Box 695, Mt. Airy, MD 21771. Style sheets are available upon request. Subscriptions in the U.S. are $40 annually, $78 for two years, and $114 for three years; subscription rates for Canada are $45 (first year), $88 (two years), and $129 (three years); European subscription rates: $60 (first year), $118 (two years) $174 (three years). All subscriptions, including additional inquiries or subscription problems should be mailed to the subscription department: P.O. Box 3462, Augusta, GA 30914. Back issues are $10 per issue.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# C-FAR

***Citizens for Foreign Aid Reform*** (C-FAR), founded in 1979, is a group of free thinking Canadians. Most of us would call ourselves populists. We strongly believe in the idea of majority rule and are concerned that on key issues – from capital punishment to immigration – Canada's ruling elite arrogantly ignores the will of the majority.

**BOOKS, ETC. OF INTEREST TO THE OCCIDENTAL QUARTERLY READERS**

Where Canada's Forefathers Stood
by Alex Greer.
*Canada's political leaders, until the 1960s, socialist, liberal or conservative, were united in the view that Canada was a European country.* $4.00

Parliament versus the People
by Doug Collins.
*Canada's leading immigration reformer, the late journalist Doug Collins, demonstrates the gap between the open door enthusiasts in Parliament and the people.* $3.00

Belize: Anatomy of a Multiracial Society
by Robert Jarvis.
*A detailed case study. Multiculturalism just doesn't work.* $5.00

The Economic Cost
by Diane Francis.
*Journalist with the* National Post *tabulates the costs of immigration and skewers the argument that we need immigrants for economic growth.* $22.00

Waging War From Canada: Why Canada is the Perfect Base for Organizing, Supporting and Conducting International Insurgency
by Mike Pearson.
*A stunning indictment of Canada's porous borders by an insider.* $20.00

The Truth About Immigration: Exposing the Economic and Humanitarian Myths
by Mike Taylor.
*Former Canadian immigration officer exposes the heartless policy designed by big business to flood the country with poorly skilled Third Worlders to keep down the minimum wage.* $20.00

The Immigration Threat to Quebec
by Gilbert Gendron.
*How immigration may succeed where war and conquest failed – to obliterate the French presence in North America.* $4.00

Red China's Plan for World Domination
by Paul Fromm.
*Audio cassette. Based on Canadian intelligence sources, Fromm exposes how, via immigration, Chinese businessmen and criminal triads tied to Red Chinese intelligence form part of China's war plans against North America.* $6.00

THE CANADIAN IMMIGRATION HOTLINE
*Monthly four-page, hard hitting report – the voice the immigration lobby hates. Special features – Crime Watch and Health Watch.* 12 month subscription $20.00

Order from **C-FAR Books**
Send cheque or VISA number and expiration date to
**C-FAR Books** • Box 332 • Rexdale, ON. • M9W 5L3 • Canada.
Please add $7 postage and handling to all orders.




LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Glayde Whitney (1939-2002) R.I.P.

On January 9, 2002 Glayde Whitney, Professor of Psychology at Florida State University, died at age 62 from natural causes. As a distinguished member of *The Occidental Quarterly's* editorial advisory board, Glayde assisted our efforts on editorial matters. His honesty, pleasant demeanor, fast wit, analytical perception, intelligence, and unwavering commitment to advancing Western civilization were hallmarks of this phenomenal educator.

His views on the genetical basis of racial differences challenged the conventional orthodoxy among contemporary behavior geneticists. As one who valued the pursuit of fundamental truths rather than the superficial satisfaction that accompanies career advancement via social conformity or political expediency, Glayde followed in the footsteps of William Shockley, Henry Garrett, and Dwight Ingle in devoting the twilight of his career to studying genetic-based racial differences in IQ, criminality, and personality traits. As a tenured professor of psychology at Florida State University, Glayde's steadfast determination to persevere, often in the face of rabid hostility, standing firmly on principle rather than buckle under to the social pressures of conformity, earned the respect of his intellectual peers.

As one of his last written pieces, Glayde's review of Joseph Graves' *The Emperor's New Clothes* (see p. 91) is a devastating critique of racial egalitarianism masquerading as science. The review is a fitting reminder of Glayde's insightfulness, which, along with those wide suspenders, will certainly be missed. May he rest in peace.

(The family has asked that donations in Glayde's memory be made to: The Charles Martel Society, P.O. Box 3462 Augusta, GA 30914. The Charles Martel Society is a non-profit organization. Contributions are tax deductible.)



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Right Now!

*A magazine of politics, ideas and culture*

## Britain's most outspoken magazine

Since 1993, *Right Now!* has been thinking the unthinkable and saying the unsayable with panache and style.

Our combination of respected interviewees and contributors, uncensored but thoughtful articles, international news, cutting gossip and arts coverage has earned us friends and enemies across the world.

Isn't it time you read the magazine everyone's talking about? Send for your free sample copy today.

**Dept OQ,**
**Box 361,**
**78 Marylebone High Street,**
**London,**
**W1U 5AP,**
**United Kingdom.**

***Telephone*:**
**+44 1507 339 056**

***E-mail*:**
**rightnow@**
**compuserve.com**

***Internet*:**
**www.right-now.org**

***It's time for change***

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# The Case for Pearl Harbor Revisionism

Steve Sniegoski

The prevalent view of World War II is that of the "good war"—a Manichaean conflict between good and evil. And a fundamental part of the "good war" thesis has to do with the entrance of the United States into the war as a result of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. According to this view, the cause of the war stemmed from the malign effort by Japan, run by aggressive militarists, to conquer the Far East and the Western Pacific, which was part of the overall Axis goal of global conquest. Japan's imperialistic quest was clearly immoral and severely threatened vital American interests, requiring American opposition. Since American territory stood in the way of Japanese territorial designs, the Japanese launched their sneak attack on Pearl Harbor. Although the Roosevelt administration had been aware of Japanese aggressive goals, the attack on Pearl Harbor caught it completely by surprise. To the extent that any Americans were responsible for the debacle at Pearl Harbor, establishment historians, echoing the Roosevelt administration, blamed the military commanders in Hawaii for being unprepared. A basic assumption of the mainstream position is that given the Japanese bent to conquest, war with the United States was inevitable. As mainstream historians Gordon W. Prange, Donald M. Goldstein and Katherine V. Dillon put it: "nothing in the available evidence... indicates that they [the Japanese] ever planned to move one inch out of their appointed path, whatever the United States did about it."[1] There was nothing the United States could do to avert war short of sacrificing vital security interests and the essence of international morality.

A small group of revisionist investigators have disputed this orthodox interpretation at almost every turn. Revisionists argue that, instead of following an aggressive plan of conquest, Japanese moves were fundamentally defensive efforts to protect vital Japanese interests. And instead of seeing the United States simply reacting to Japanese aggression, as the orthodox version would have it, the revisionists see the United States goading the Japanese—by aiding China (with whom Japan was at war), military expansion, quasi-secret alliances, and economic warfare—to take belligerent actions. Finally, some



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revisionists go so far as to claim that Roosevelt had foreknowledge of the attack on Pearl Harbor but refused to alert the military commanders in order to have a *casus belli* to galvanize the American people for war. These revisionists see the effort as part of Roosevelt's effort to bring the United States into war with Germany—the so-called "back-door-to-war" thesis.

Revisionism began before the end of World War II and reflected the views of the non-interventionists who had opposed American entry into the war. Prominent figures in the revisionist camp include: Charles Beard, Harry Elmer Barnes, George Morgenstern and Charles C. Tansill in the 1940s and 1950s; James J. Martin and Percy Greaves in the 1960s and 1970s; and more recently John Toland and Robert B. Stinnett. And some writers have accepted parts of the revisionist position but rejected others. The idea that American foreign policy provoked the Japanese into more belligerent actions, for example, has gained more adherents than the view that President Roosevelt intentionally allowed the Japanese to attack Pearl Harbor. This essay, however, will not present a historiographical discussion of the revisionist literature bringing out the similarities and differences of the various revisionist authors' writings. This has been done elsewhere, most notably by Frank Paul Mintz in his *Revisionism and the Origins of Pearl Harbor*.[2] This essay will try to elucidate the major revisionist themes and to show their validity. In short, this essay hopes to provide what its title proclaims: "The Case for Pearl Harbor Revisionism."

## The Causes of Japanese Expansionism

Revisionists have focused on the underlying causes of Japanese expansionism in an effort to counter the mainstream view of the nefarious nature of Japanese policy. As Frank Paul Mintz writes:

> The revisionists demonstrated—and quite compellingly in some cases--that it makes for a poor historical interpretation to condemn Japan without coming to grips with the strategic, demographic, and economic problems which were at the root of Japan's—not to mention any nation's—imperialism.[3]

Revisionists emphasize that the Japanese had vital economic and security interests in China. Lacking in natural resources, Japan had especially depended upon foreign markets. Thus, access to China became absolutely essential to Japan's economic well-being when, with the onset of the Great Depression, most industrialized countries established nearly insurmountable trade barriers.[4] Instead of being an aggressor, Japan had been essentially satisfied with the status quo in China at the start of the 1930s, but as the decade progressed, the forces of Chinese communism and nationalism threatened Japanese interests



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in China. "It seemed to Tokyo," Charles C. Tansill wrote, "that Japanese interests in North China were about to be crushed between the millstones of Chinese nationalism and Russian Bolshevism."[5]

The revisionists portray the Japanese interests in China as similar to American interests in Latin America. As Anthony Kubek writes:

> The United States had its danger zone in the Caribbean and since the era of Thomas Jefferson, every effort had been to strengthen the American position and to keep foreign nations from establishing naval and military bases which would threaten American security. So Japan regarded Manchuria. Japan followed this natural policy and attempted to practice it with reference to the lands that bordered upon the China Sea. Korea, Manchuria, and Inner Mongolia were essential pillars of her defense structure.[6]

While the establishment interpretation emphasizes that the Japanese incursion into China was a violation of Chinese territorial integrity, the revisionists point out that the United States was highly selective in applying this standard. During the inter-war period, the Soviet Union had converted Outer Mongolia into a satellite and secured de facto control over Sinkiang, yet the State Department never protested Moscow's violations of Chinese sovereignty. And Japanese actions in China were, in part, taken as defensive measures against the growing threat of Soviet Communism. Looking beyond the moral and legal aspects, revisionists maintain that Japanese interests in China did not portend further aggression into Southeast Asia or threaten vital American interests. Rather, American actions—aid to China, military expansion, and economic sanctions—purportedly intended to deter Japanese aggression actually served to induce such aggression into Southeast Asia and ultimately led to the Japanese attack on American territory. This is not to say that there were not extremist, militarist elements in Japan who sought military conquest. But in the immediate pre-Pearl Harbor period, the Japanese government was run by more moderate elements who sought to maintain peace with the United States and who were undermined by American intransigence. As Bruce Russett writes:

> This analysis is meant to establish an important proposition: that the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, and for that matter on Southeast Asia, is not evidence of any unlimited expansionist policy or capability by the Japanese government. It was the consequence only of a much less ambitious goal, centering on an unwillingness to surrender the position that the Japanese had fought for years to establish in China. When that refusal met an equal American determination that Japan should give up many of



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

her gains in China, the result was war. Japanese expansion into Southeast Asia originated less in strength than in weakness; it was predominantly instrumental to the China campaign, not a reach for another slice of global salami. Of course, there were Japanese political and military leaders with wider ambitions, but they were not predominant in policy-making.[7]

## Anti-Japanese Provocations

In the two years prior to Pearl Harbor, the United States took a number of hostile actions against the Japanese. While the orthodox version portrays this as an effort to deter Japanese aggression, revisionists see this as a deliberate means of provoking war. Robert B. Stinnett, a recent revisionist, goes so far as to claim that the ways to goad the Japanese into war were explicitly spelled out in an "eight action memo" by Lt. Commander Arthur H. McCollum, head of the Far East Section at the Office of Naval Intelligence, which was dated October 7, 1940. President Roosevelt adopted McCollum's proposals. "Throughout 1941...," Stinnett writes, "provoking Japan into an overt act of war was the principal policy that guided FDR's actions toward Japan."[8] These anti-Japanese provocative actions would fall into three categories: aid to China; military aggressiveness that included military agreements with the British and Dutch; and economic sanctions against the Japan.

## Aid to China

It should be pointed out that the United States had, since the turn of the century, provided vocal support for the territorial integrity of China, with emphasis on the "Open Door" that rejected economic spheres of interest by foreign countries. And American military strategists had long envisioned a future war with Japan. However, it was not until the Roosevelt administration that vocal support turned into action. By 1940, the U.S. was providing substantial support for China, which had been at war with Japan since 1937. During that year, the U.S. loaned China $125 million.[9] In 1941, the U.S. extended Lend-Lease to China, which enabled China to receive American war materials without involving payment. The U.S. government covertly sponsored an American-manned air force for China—General Claire Chennault's American Volunteer Group or the "Flying Tigers." Although officially "volunteers," they were actually closely connected to the American military.[10] Under the law of neutrality as traditionally understood, a neutral state is obliged to treat the belligerents with strict impartiality, which means abstaining from providing any of them military support. Obviously, the U.S. was not acting as a "neutral" in the Japanese-Chinese conflict and, by the current "harboring terrorists" standard invoked by the U.S. in Afghanistan, provided justification for the Japanese to make war on it.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The effect of American aid to China was to stiffen Chinese resistance, thus precluding any type of peaceful settlement favorable to the Japanese. The Japanese actually looked to the U.S. to mediate the war in China and thus help to extricate them from an exhausting stalemate. As non- revisionist historian Jonathan G. Utley observes:

> They [U.S. government officials] could have ended the fighting by fashioning a compromise settlement, but they saw no future in that. It was better to let the fighting continue to its inevitable conclusion, a military debacle that would drag down the Japanese militarists.[11]

It was Japan's inability to terminate the war with China successfully that motivated its military expansion elsewhere.

## Secret Commitments

In the first part of 1941, joint military staff conferences took place between the Americans, British, Canadians, and the Dutch to develop plans for global war against the Axis, although the United States was not yet a belligerent. Of greatest importance for the Pacific theater was a meeting in Singapore in April 1941 between the Americans, British, and Dutch. Out of this meeting came the ADB (sometimes called ABCD because of the Canadian involvement in the other meetings) agreement, which committed the conferees to joint action to fight Japan if Japanese forces crossed a geographic line that approximated the northerly extremity of the Dutch East Indies. War would result if Japan invaded British or Dutch territories in Southern Asia or moved into neutral Thailand. In essence, Roosevelt had committed the U.S. to war even if American territory were not attacked. And he had committed the U.S. to war even if the Japanese did not fire the first shot. Prange, Goldstein, and Dillon try to argue that the ADB agreement did not actually commit the United States to make war but only "outlined the military strategy to be followed if the U.S. joined the conflict."[12] This interpretation, however, ignores the fact that central to the ADB agreement was the criterion for joining the conflict—the Japanese crossing of a particular geographical line. Even one of the early defenders of the Roosevelt administration, Herbert Feis, acknowledged this significance in his history: "Had not the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor and the Philippines, this line would have become the boundary between war and peace."[13]

Though America's commitment to the ADB agreement was only verbal, the British and Dutch took it as a solid commitment, and the U.S. armed forces drew up a war plan in harmony with it, which became known as WPL forty-six. When the Japanese actually crossed the critical geographic line in December 1941, the Dutch invoked the ADB and were



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expecting help from the U.S. Navy in repelling the Japanese. Obviously, the Dutch believed the U.S. would back them up, since they would hardly dare to face the mighty Japanese military by themselves.[14]

That the U.S. was preparing military opposition to an armed Japanese advance southward is illustrated by actions as well as words. For this was the whole purpose of American buildup of air power in the Philippines, discussed in the next section. Certainly, the message conveyed to the British and Dutch as well as the Japanese was that the United States would go to war even if its territory were not attacked.

According to the United States Constitution, of course, the U.S. could not just make war because of the President's military commitment. Only Congress has the power to declare war. Roosevelt needed an armed incident with Japan so as to have the public support to comply with his commitment to war. (Roosevelt did promise "armed support" to the British prior to a declaration of war.[15]) Without such an incident, a declaration of war to counter a Japanese armed advance southward would have been politically difficult, if not impossible. That is why Pearl Harbor was a godsend from Roosevelt's standpoint.

Historian Robert Smith Thompson shows that the military action planned by the Americans, British, and Dutch went beyond simply a defensive effort to stop a Japanese aggressive move southward. They actually planned to go on the offensive. Thompson writes:

> First, the ABD powers intended to confine Japan 'as nearly as possible to the defense of her main islands. Second, they proposed to 'cut Japan off from all sea communications with China and the outside world by intensive action in the air and waters around Japan, and to destroy by air attack her war industries. Two months before the Pearl Harbor attack, that is, the United States of America was party to a secret international agreement to firebomb Japan.[16]

## Military Build-Up and Provocations

In order to carry out its anti-Japanese policy, the United States was building up its military strength in the Far East. In 1940, President Roosevelt had ordered the move of the Pacific Fleet from its permanent base in San Diego, California to Pearl Harbor. By the fall of 1941, however, the development of a B-17 bomber force in the Philippines had been given precedence over the fleet as the key means of combating Japan. Its purpose could be construed as offensive as well as a deterrent since the United States was planning to bomb Japanese cities. A secret memo General MacArthur received in September 1941 underscored the offensive purposes that American forces would undertake. It read:

> [C]ommence operation as soon as possible, concentrating on



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

propaganda, terrorism, and sabotage of Japanese communications and military installations.. Assassination of individual Japanese should also be considered. Prepare to defeat Japan without suffering grievous loss ourselves... We must base mobile forces as near to Japan as is practicable... To the west there is China where air bases are already being prepared and stocked... To the south there is Luzon in the Philippine Islands, within easy air range of Hainan, Formosa, and Canton, and extreme range of southern Japan... Development of further air bases is proceeding.[17] Earlier, Roosevelt had gone so far as to deploy American warships within or adjacent to Japanese territorial waters. Roosevelt called these "pop-up" cruises, saying, "I just want them to keep popping up here and there and keep the Japs guessing. I don't mind losing one or two cruisers, but do not take a chance on losing five or six." Admiral Husband E. Kimmel, commander of the Pacific Fleet, opposed this provocation, saying: "It is ill-advised and will result in war if we make this move." Between March and July 1941, Roosevelt sent naval task groups into Japanese waters on three different occasions. Japan protested but fired no shots.[18]

## Economic Sanctions

America took a number of measures to punish Japan economically. In July 1939, the United States announced that it would end its trade treaty with Japan in January 1940. In October 1940, the U.S. banned the export of scrap iron thus impeding the Japanese production of weapons-grade steel. In July 1941, when Japanese forces moved into southern French Indo-China (having already occupied the northern part in 1940), Roosevelt announced his most drastic measure: the freezing of all Japanese assets in the U.S. This deprived the Japanese of the means to purchase American goods, the most critical of which was oil.[19] The British and Dutch governments followed suit. Japan had to import all of its oil from foreign countries--most coming from the U.S.--because neither Japan nor Japanese-controlled territory in China produced oil. Without oil, the life-blood of the mechanized Japanese army, Japan would be unable to continue its war in China. The U.S. (and the British and Dutch) made it clear to the Japanese that the oil embargo would be relaxed only in exchange for an end to Japanese involvement in China. The *New York Times* referred to Roosevelt's action in its July 27 issue as "the most drastic blow short of war."[20]

Mainstream historians have interpreted American cooperation with the British and Dutch as well as the military build-up in the Far East as simply deterrents against further Japanese expansion. Nonetheless, it is easy to understand how the Japanese perceived these developments as a threat to their own security. Such a view seemed to be confirmed by the assets freeze, which implied a move beyond a simple defensive



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

containment of Japan, indicating rather an effort to roll back Japan's existing gains in China.

All factions of the Japanese government—moderates as well as extremists—saw the complete abandonment of China as unacceptable. Japan had expended too much blood and treasure simply to pull out. Abandoning China would destroy Japan's status as a great power and would cause dire economic harm. But without oil, Japan would ultimately be militarily threatened in its own backyard by the Anglo-American alliance. Moreover, it was not the Japanese war machine alone that was affected. For in addition to freezing assets, the United States government had closed the Panama Canal to Japanese shipping. As a result of these economic sanctions, along with the decline in trade stemming from the Russo-German war, Japanese imports fell by 75 percent, and the civilian economy spiraled downward, with serious food shortages.[21] The Japanese Foreign Minister, Shigenori Togo, vigorously protested to American Ambassador Joseph Grew that "Economic pressure of this character is capable of menacing national existence to a greater degree than the direct use of force."[22]

To save the domestic economy and to be able to continue prosecuting the war in China, Japan required oil and other natural resources—tin, rubber, quinine, rice—that could only be obtained by seizing Thailand, British Malaya, and the Dutch East Indies. These areas would have to be attacked soon before the Japanese Navy's fuel supplies ran low and before the Anglo-American alliance had developed a powerful military force in the Far East. Of course, Japanese armed movement into these areas would automatically lead to conflict with the ADB powers. "In the last estimate," revisionist George Morgenstern averred, "Japan was confronted with the option of striking out for a rich new empire or abandoning its conquests and resigning itself to the future of a third-rate nation."[23]

Significantly, the United States government had enacted the economic sanctions with a clear realization that this could lead to war. Admiral Richmond Kelly Turner, Navy chief of war plans, had prepared a report for President Roosevelt on the probable consequences of imposing an oil embargo on Japan, which read:

> It is generally believed that shutting off the American supply of petroleum will lead promptly to an invasion of the Netherlands East Indies... An embargo on exports will have an immediate severe psychological reaction in Japan against the United States. It is almost certain to intensify the determination of those now in power to continue their present course. Furthermore, it seems certain that, if Japan should then take military measures against the British and Dutch, she would also include military action



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against the Philippines, which would immediately involve us in a Pacific war.[24]

## PROVOKING JAPAN INTO ATTACKING THE UNITED STATES

To think that American forces in the Far East, with their small number of American B-17 bombers and weak British and Dutch allies, could actually stand up to the powerful Japanese war machine in late 1941 was to engage in wishful thinking in the extreme. But when such military developments reached the ears of the security conscious Japanese, they could easily serve as an inducement to launch a preemptive strike on American forces in the Pacific. Japanese leaders had for some time thought that the United States would make war on Japan if it made an armed advance southward toward British and Dutch territory, even if such territories were not actually attacked. For example, on December 3, 1941, the Japanese embassy in Washington cabled Tokyo: "Judging from indications, we feel that some joint military action between Great Britain and the United States, with or without a declaration of war, is a definite certainty in the event of an occupation of Thailand."[25]

Considerable information on the buildup of American air power in the Far East and its threat to Japan could be easily gleaned from the public media. For example, the *U.S. News* of October 31, 1941 carried a two-page relief map of the globe with Japan at the center. Arrows were drawn from American bases to Japan with flying times of American bombers. *Time* magazine of November 21, 1941 carried a story about the builder of the new B-24 bomber, Reuben Harris, and said that these new bombers were already being transported to the Dutch East Indies. The headline of an article by noted columnist Arthur Krock in the November 19, 1941 *New York Times* read: "New Air Power Gives [Philippine] Islands Offensive Strength Changing Strategy in Pacific."[26]

On November 15, 1941, General George Marshall held a secret press briefing for representatives from the major media—the *New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Time, Newsweek,* the Associated Press, United Press, and International News Service. Pledging the group to secrecy, Marshall asserted that "We are preparing an offensive war against Japan." Marshall said that war would probably begin during the first ten days of December and then he went on to delineate a bombing scenario of the Japanese home islands. If this military information were intended to be secret, it is odd that Marshall would mention it to the press at all. Robert Smith Thompson infers that this reflected President Roosevelt's aim to pass this information on to the Japanese indirectly. "Acting as Roosevelt's representative," Thompson opines, "General Marshall spoke to the press, quite likely in the full knowledge that somebody would leak his remarks."[27] This exaggerated depiction of



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American air power that could hit Japanese cities certainly would have the effect of inducing the Japanese to gamble on striking the first blow against the United States while there was still time.

## JAPAN'S DECISION FOR WAR

The Japanese viewed the American arms to China, the military build-up, and the apparent military alliance between the ABD powers as constituting the Anglo-American "encirclement" of Japan. As Bruce Russett writes: "The freezing of assets on July 26, 1941, was seen as the final link in their bondage."[28] Japan's aim was to become a powerful, industrial nation that would not be dominated by outside powers as the Far East had been treated by the European colonial powers. But the Japanese saw this goal as being frustrated by the United States, which, in conjunction with European colonial powers, seemed bent on making Japan a weak, third-rate country, like other Asian nations. To the Japanese this was unbearable. There was nothing abnormal about this response. It should be emphasized that since the time of the Monroe Doctrine the United States has sought to have its way in the Western hemisphere, unhindered by the interference of European powers. It would seem to be an empirical fact of world affairs that only weak countries allow themselves to be dictated to by outside powers within their own geographical region.

According to Japanese calculations, the United States would go to war against them if they made a military advance toward British or Dutch territory. In November 1941, the Japanese envoys in the United States were even reporting to Tokyo that the United States might soon militarily occupy the Dutch East Indies as it had earlier occupied Iceland and Dutch Guiana.[29] All of this meant that if Japan wanted to acquire the necessary resources of Southeast Asia and break out of the ever-tightening Anglo-American "encirclement," it would have to strike a blow against American power quickly. As Robert Smith Thompson asserts: "With American economic sanctions in place and with American B-17s en route to the Pacific, Japan had only one choice. Japan had to strike—and strike first."[30] The Japanese saw America's Pacific Fleet stationed at Pearl Harbor as a significant threat to their military designs in Southeast Asia. "The implication was clear," Thompson concludes, "Japan's only salvation lay in taking out the United States Pacific fleet, wherever it lay."[31]

The Japanese military leadership recognized the much greater military potential of the United States and opted for war only because there seemed to be no other alternative. Its aims against the United States were limited: to destroy existing United States offensive capabilities in the Pacific by tactical surprise. The Japanese military



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leadership hoped only to give its forces time to occupy the islands of the Southwest Pacific, to extract the raw materials of those islands, and to turn the region into a virtually impregnable line of defense, which could frustrate an American counteroffensive.[32]

## JAPAN'S WILLINGNESS TO NEGOTIATE

Japanese war planners emphasized that the attack would have to take place soon because oil supplies were running out. Although Japan was preparing for war, however, it still sought a last minute peace with the United States. In short, war would be the instrument of last resort if Japan were unable to restore trade with the United States by diplomatic means. It sent its major diplomats to Washington in an effort to achieve peace. In August 1941, Prime Minister Prince Konoye even offered to come to meet President Roosevelt in Washington for negotiations. As Morgenstern writes: "The American diplomatic representatives in Tokyo noted that, almost until the very end, Konoye and the moderate elements were willing to go to almost any lengths to bring off the meeting and avert war."[33] Roosevelt rejected Konoye's offer. As a result of its failure to achieve a diplomatic solution, Konoye's moderate government fell from power in October and was replaced by a more militant group headed by General Hideki Tojo. Although this indicated a step toward war, Japan still sought to negotiate with the United States. Among its offers, Japan was willing to promise the United States that it would pull out of southern Indo-China and not join Germany in an offensive war. In return, Japan expected the United States to restore trade, to encourage the Chinese government to negotiate with Japan, and to stop backing China militarily once the negotiations had begun. The United States refused to accept the Japanese offer.[34]

## MODUS VIVENDI

Japan was still seeking a diplomatic solution in November while it prepared to attack. American intelligence had broken the Japanese diplomatic code, and thus the American leadership was aware that if no diplomatic solution were reached, Japan would then go to war. However, the only conciliatory move the Roosevelt administration ever considered making was a *modus vivendi*, which would have been a temporary truce, sought by American military leaders, to avoid war until America had built up its military strength in the Far East. The modus vivendi would have entailed mutual American and Japanese pledges against aggressive moves in the Pacific. Japan would withdraw from southern Indo-China and limit its troops in the north. In return the U.S. would supply Japan with limited supplies of oil and other materials.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The U.S. government ultimately rejected the *modus vivendi* on November 26 and instead offered Secretary of State Cordell Hull's "10 point proposal." This virtual ultimatum told Japan to withdraw all military and police forces from China and Indo-China and that it must not support any government in China other than the Nationalist government under Chiang. Japan regarded the message as an insult and completely unacceptable. Japan regarded a sphere of influence in China as absolutely essential to its national security, and it had expended much blood and wealth to attain this objective. To accede to the American proposal would be tantamount to surrender. The American proposal essentially cemented Japan's decision to initiate war and strike Pearl Harbor.

A brief aside here regarding the rejection of the "*modus vivendi*." Revisionists, such as Anthony Kubek in *How the Far East Was Lost*, have pointed out that pro-Communists in the United States government, most importantly Harry Dexter White, pushed for the elimination of the "*modus vivendi*" in order to enhance the security interests of the Soviet Union. The Soviet aim was to guarantee war between Japan and the West in order to prevent a Japanese attack on the Soviet Far East. This Communist role has been confirmed by recent revelations from the Venona files by Herb Romerstein and John Earl Haynes.[35] Most revisionists, however, would maintain that Roosevelt did not require the push from Soviet spies to induce his movement toward war. As Harry Elmer Barnes noted,

> Despite all this volume of evidence of communist pressure in the Far East for war between the United States and Japan, I remain unconvinced that it exerted any decisive influence upon Roosevelt, who, after all, determined American policy toward Japan. Roosevelt had made up his mind with regard to war with Japan on the basis of his own attitudes and wishes, aided and abetted by Stimson, and he did not need any persuasion or support from the Communists, however much he may have welcomed their aggressive propaganda.[36]

## American Motives

On the surface, it would seem that the United States pursued a policy that led to war in order to preserve the territorial integrity of China over which it was unwilling to make any compromise with Japan that could preserve the peace. As historian Basil Rauch wrote in defense of the Roosevelt administration's uncompromising policy:

> No one but an absolute pacifist would argue that the danger of war is a greater evil than violation of principle... The isolationist believes that appeasement of Japan without China's consent violated no principle worth a risk of war. The internationalist must believe that the principle did justify a risk of war.[37]



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

However, the preservation of Chinese territorial integrity, which did not seem to involve American security, appears an odd reason for which to go to war. Moreover, it should be pointed out that the professed American concern for Chinese territorial integrity was highly selective. After entering the war, the United States did very little to help China, focusing instead on fighting Germany. Also, the United States government had never criticized the Soviet Union for its violations of Chinese territorial integrity—detaching Outer Mongolia in the 1920s (making it a satellite) and gaining control of Sinkiang province in the 1930s. And in 1945, Roosevelt explicitly violated Chinese territory in the Far East protocol of the Yalta Accord by giving the Soviet Union rights to the ports of Darien and Port Arthur and control of the railways in Manchuria. As historian Anthony Kubek incisively points out:

> The Soviet Union had no more right to hold these ports and railways in Manchuria than did Japan... Roosevelt gave to Stalin at Yalta effective control of the same territory over which the United States had gone to war with Japan.[38]

It should be emphasized that in contrast to Japan, which actually controlled Chinese territory, the Soviet Union did not already occupy these territories. Rather, Roosevelt seemingly held Chinese sovereignty in such low regard that he thought he had the right to dispose of this Chinese territory in order to bribe Stalin into making war on Japan.[39]

## Back Door to War

But if China was not the real issue, what was America's motive for war? Roosevelt, like all interventionists, believed Japan was part of an Axis plot to dominate the world, which would threaten American security and values. But once the war began the Roosevelt administration put most of its effort into fighting Germany, which it had planned to do before Pearl Harbor. Because of this emphasis on Germany, revisionists see Roosevelt's effort to provoke war with Japan as an indirect way of getting the country into war with Germany—the back-door-to-war thesis.

Roosevelt had to take such an indirect approach to war with Germany because a direct approach was not politically feasible. Throughout 1941, Roosevelt believed it was essential for the United States to enter the war against Germany, but he recognized that the majority of the American people opposed such a war even as late as the fall of 1941. Thus, Roosevelt had to rely on deceptive means to edge the country into war. To placate public sentiment, Roosevelt, in his 1940 reelection campaign, had pledged that he would keep the country out of war. Roosevelt publicly preached that his aid-short-of-war policies—such as Lend-Lease, the destroyers-for-bases deal, de facto naval



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

convoys of British ships—were intended to keep the U.S. out of war. However, such clearly unneutral acts would inevitably lead to incidents with Germany.

Despite America's unneutral provocations, Hitler sought peace with the United States because he wanted to concentrate on the war with the Soviet Union. Thus, he ordered German submarine commanders to avoid incidents with American ships. Incidents, however, were inevitable. In an apparent effort to generate war fever, Roosevelt deliberately distorted two naval incidents in fall of 1941—involving the USS Greer and the USS Kearney—claiming that the Germans had fired on innocent American vessels.[40] In reality, the German submarines were responding to American provocations. Roosevelt also promoted other falsehoods in the hopes of stoking the fires of war, which included the claim that the United States government had come into the possession of a "secret Nazi map" of South and Central America showing how that continent would be organized under Nazi rule. Also, Roosevelt said he had a Nazi German document that detailed a plan to abolish all religions and liquidate all clergy and create an "International Nazi Church." Needless to say, the alleged map and document were not made public then or since.[41]

By the end of November 1941, an undeclared naval war existed in the Atlantic as American ships were following a "shoot-on-sight" policy. Roosevelt had the power to do almost everything to aid Great Britain and the Soviet Union—including transporting arms and, for the British, convoying troops—except to send in American land and air forces to fight Germany directly. But despite the impact of events and the pro-war propaganda, fully eighty percent of the American public still opposed a declaration of war. And Congress was still staunchly opposed to war. And America's belligerent actions could not provoke Germany into a serious incident that could generate American support for full-scale war. Thus, Roosevelt would have to enter war through the back door. That Roosevelt made use of falsehoods and deception regarding the European War made it understandable that he would rely on the same deceptive tactics to become involved in war with Japan.

Revisionists contend that entrance into war with Japan would facilitate American war with Germany. Although many revisionist critics fail to see the connection because the Axis alliance did not require German entrance into an offensive war initiated by Japan, people at the time saw an inextricable link between war with Japan and war with Germany. As Secretary of Interior Harold Ickes, one of the more strident



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and committed interventionists in the Administration, confided to his diary:

> For a long time I have believed that our best entrance into the war would be by way of Japan... And, of course, if we go to war against Japan, it will inevitably lead to war against Germany.[42]

In his December 9, 1941 radio address, President Roosevelt accused Germany of being closely involved in the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. According to Roosevelt, "We know that Germany and Japan are conducting their military and naval operations with a joint plan." Roosevelt alleged that "Germany has been telling Japan that if Japan would attack the United States Japan would share the spoils when peace came."[43] With the American public outraged about the underhanded "surprise" attack on Pearl Harbor, it would not have been difficult to direct that anger at Germany, especially with the inevitability of additional incidents in the Atlantic. And given the likelihood of all-out war with the United States, Hitler quite reasonably declared war on the United States on December 11, in order to gain the good will of the Japanese government, who, he hoped, might reciprocate by making war on the Soviet Union. As Thomas Fleming writes in his *The New Dealers' War*, Roosevelt was "trying to bait Hitler into declaring war, or, failing that, persuade the American people to support an American declaration of war on the two European fascist powers."[44]

## Move Toward War

It should be emphasized that the United States took a hard-line approach to Japan even though it was aware that such an approach would cause Japan to make war. United States military intelligence had broken the Japanese top diplomatic code and was reading Japanese diplomatic communications. Besides the actual code-breakers, only a few top-level people in the Roosevelt administration had access to this information. Through Japan's diplomatic messages, it was apparent that Japan would take military action to grab the necessary resources, if a favorable diplomatic solution were not achieved. How much more the United States knew about Japanese war plans is debated among historians. Even among revisionists, some would hold that at least as late as the first days of December 1941, Roosevelt was not certain that the Japanese would directly attack American territory.

All of this put Roosevelt in a bind because it of his secret commitment to the British and Dutch that the United States would make war against Japan if it moved southward. The problem was whether the American people would be willing to support a war against the Japanese to preserve British and Dutch colonial possessions or (even



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

less likely) to help the British prevent the Japanese occupation of Thailand, which was part of the ADB military plan.

Harry Elmer Barnes wrote that the secret military arrangements with the British and the Dutch "hung like a sword of Damocles over Roosevelt's head" as the Japanese moved toward a war.

> It exposed him to the most dangerous dilemma of his political career: to start a war without an attack on American forces or territory, or refusing to follow up the implementation of ABCD and Rainbow 5 [the military plan based on the agreement] by Britain or the Dutch. The latter [decision] would lead to serious controversy and quarrels among the prospective powers, with the disgruntled powers leaking Roosevelt's complicity in the plan and exposing his mendacity.[45]

In the early days of December, Roosevelt assured the nervous British that the United States would honor its commitment to fight the Japanese if they moved southward. As the British historian John Costello writes, British documents

> can leave no doubt that Roosevelt by the eve of Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor had given a number of clear, carefully worded assurances of United States 'armed support' of Britain in advance of delivering his intended appeal to Congress.[46]

Roosevelt's monumental problem was how to get Japan to attack the United States in some way in order to solidify the American public behind war. As Secretary of War Henry Stimson wrote in his diary of November 25, 1941: "The question was how we should maneuver them into the position of firing the first shot without allowing too much danger to ourselves."[47] The wording here is critical and is usually glossed over by defenders of orthodoxy. Stimson's writing definitely implies that the United States would not simply passively await a possible attack by Japanese but would actively "manuever" Japanese into attacking United States. Roosevelt thus sought to create an incident in which the U.S. would be attacked by the Japanese. It is here that certain apparent differences among revisionists appear. If, as many revisionists have claimed, Roosevelt had foreknowledge of the impending Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, why would he see any reason to create an incident, rather than simply await the attack? It would thus seem that as of the beginning of December, Roosevelt either was not certain that the Japanese war plan included an attack on American territory, or else he sought a less destructive incident in order to save the Pacific Fleet.

## Three Small Ships

Roosevelt's planned incident consisted of sending "three small vessels" on an alleged reconnaissance mission. He personally



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

authorized this mission in a December 1 message to Admiral Thomas Hart, head of the Asiatic Fleet at Manila. Roosevelt specified that each ship was to be manned by Filipino sailors and commanded by an American naval officer. Furthermore, each vessel was to be armed with cannon so as to give it the minimum requirements of an American "man of war." The three little ships were directed to sail into the path of a Japanese naval task force that Washington knew was then steaming southward for an invasion of Southeast Asia.[48]

It was highly unusual for a President to be giving such a detailed order for a lower level military function. Moreover, as Thomas Fleming writes, "such a voyage might have made sense in the eighteenth or nineteenth century," but was rather absurd in an age when airplanes had infinitely greater reconnaissance capability.[49] And the only radio available for one of the ships could only receive messages, not transmit them. Moreover, Admiral Hart was already carrying out the necessary reconnaissance by air and was reporting the results to Washington. From the outset Hart seemed to recognize the real sacrificial "fishbait" purpose of the alleged reconnaissance mission.[50]

Roosevelt's apparent intention of sending the little ships was to have them blown out of the water, thus providing an incident for war.[51] Equipped with cannon, the ships could be presented as far more significant than they actually were. The incident could be reported as American warships destroyed by the Japanese. And the killing of a Filipino crew would engender war fever in the Philippines, where there was strong resistance to getting involved in war with Japan.[52]

However, the attack on the little ships never took place. Only one ship, the *Isabel* could be equipped in short order. Admiral Hart, apparently wanting to preserve the ship, gave it instructions that were far less provocative than Roosevelt had ordered. As a result, the *Isabel* was able to avoid Japanese fire. A second ship, the *Lanakai*, was just about to leave Manila Harbor on December 7 when the attack on Pearl Harbor was announced, and a third ship had not yet been selected. In short, the Pearl Harbor attack precluded the need for Roosevelt to create an incident. However, had the American ships been attacked by the Japanese, Harry Elmer Barnes believed that Pearl Harbor could have been saved.

> There can be little doubt that the Cockleship plan of December 1st was designed to get the indispensable attack by a method which would precede the Pearl Harbor attack, avert the latter, and save the Pacific Fleet and American lives.[53]

This, of course, reflects the revisionist belief that Roosevelt knew in advance of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## Pearl Harbor Conspiracy

That Roosevelt had foreknowledge of the Pearl Harbor attack and had deliberately withheld information is the most controversial, and perhaps best known, of the revisionist arguments. The argument runs that Washington intentionally kept the military commanders in Hawaii in the dark about the impending Japanese attack. This would ensure that no countermeasures were undertaken that might cause the Japanese to call it off. It would also preclude the possibility of the American military commanders launching a preemptive attack on the Japanese fleet, which could have muddied the Japanese culpability needed to forge a united American public in favor of war.

## "Purple" Code

There is ample evidence of warnings of an impending Japanese attack being sent to American government authorities. For many years, this argument centered around the American breaking of the top Japanese diplomatic code. It was discussed at the Army and Navy Pearl Harbor hearings in 1944 and the 1945-46 congressional hearings. The United States military had broken the top Japanese diplomatic code, which was called "Purple," with a specially-constructed code-breaking machine, also called "Purple." The deciphered texts were referred to as "Magic." Only a few top-level people in the Roosevelt administration had access to this information. The military commanders at Pearl Harbor were not provided with a "Purple" code-breaking machine. And although they were given some intelligence information based on "Purple," they were denied the most crucial information that pointed to war. By late November 1941, code intercepts read in Washington indicated that Japan was about to make war and break relations with the United States. The deciphered diplomatic messages did not specify Pearl Harbor as the target, but, given that top Washington officials recognized the imminence of war, it is odd why they did not order a full military alert for Hawaii in order to play it safe. The actual code-breakers such as Captain Laurance F. Safford, head of the Communications Security Section of Naval Communications, assumed that such a warning had been given.

## "War Warning"

Defenders of the administration would claim that Washington had provided adequate warning to the Pearl Harbor commanders of a possible attack and that the latter had failed to take sufficient defensive preparations. This view was embodied in the 1942 Roberts Commission investigation on Pearl Harbor and, in a milder form, in the 1946 Majority Report of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack. Pearl Harbor investigator Henry Clausen, who in



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1944-1945 had investigated the background of the attack at the behest of Secretary of War Stimson, goes to great lengths in his *Pearl Harbor: Final Judgment* (published in 1992) to try to show that even if the military leaders in Hawaii had simply read the newspapers they should have prepared for a possible Japanese attack.[54] In Henry Stimson's final statement to the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, which was drafted by Clausen, he asserted that even without a warning from Washington, General Walter C. Short, who was responsible for the defense of Hawaii,

> [S]hould have been on the alert. If he did not know that the relations between Japan and the United States were strained and broken at any time, he must have been the only man in Hawaii who did not know it, for the radio and newspapers were blazoning these facts daily ... And if he did not know that the Japanese were likely to strike without warning, he could have read his history of Japan or known the lessons taught in the Army schools in respect to such matters.[55]

This defense of the Roosevelt administration is filled with obvious contradictions. If the commanders in Hawaii are to be blamed for failing to anticipate an attack on Pearl Harbor, how can the defenders of the Roosevelt administration likewise claim that there was no reason for Washington to realize that the Japanese would target Pearl Harbor? And if the likelihood of a Japanese attack should have been realized by simply keeping abreast of public news reports, how could Roosevelt make so much of the idea of a "surprise attack"—the major theme of his famous "Day of Infamy" speech?

It is hard to see how the Hawaii commanders were culpable. The most crucial alleged warnings from Washington were those of November 27, in which the phrase "war warning" was actually used. However, these warnings were totally lacking in clarity. The message to General Short was characterized by the Army Pearl Harbor Board (which investigated the Pearl Harbor attack in 1944) as a "Do-or-don't" message because of its ambiguities and contradictions.[56] The message referred to possible Japanese hostile actions with the breaking of diplomatic relations and authorized Short to take any measures he thought necessary as long as those actions did not "alarm" the general populace or "disclose intent." Moreover, Short was required to allow the Japanese to commit the first "overt act." These restrictions essentially ruled out any effective defensive preparations. General Short interpreted this message as a call to counter sabotage, which required doing such things as bunching airplanes wing tip to wing tip, thus making them sitting ducks for a bombing attack. Short informed Washington of the steps he was taking, and no corrections were



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forthcoming. In fact, subsequent warnings from Washington regarding subversion and sabotage convinced Short of the appropriateness of his actions.[57]

Admiral Stark's message to Kimmel referred to possible Japanese advances in the Far East but said nothing about any possible attack on Hawaii. As the 1944 Naval Court of Inquiry asserted, the so-called "war warning" message sent to Kimmel "directed attention away from Pearl Harbor rather than toward it."[58] Furthermore, in November, Navy officials declared the north Pacific Ocean a "vacant sea" and ordered all United States and allied shipping out of this area. This, of course, was the region over which the Japanese task force would travel. Two weeks before the Pearl Harbor attack, Kimmel actually dispatched a portion of the fleet to the sea north of Hawaii for surveillance purposes but he received an order from Washington to bring his ships back to Oahu. In essence, it would seem that information from Washington served to hinder if not prevent the commanders in Hawaii from taking the proper steps to protect their forces.[59]

To reemphasize, the defenders of the Roosevelt administration want to have it both ways: that Washington had no reason to believe that the Japanese would attack Pearl Harbor and that the commanders in Hawaii were derelict for not realizing that Hawaii might be attacked. But having access to the decoded intercepts obviously meant that Washington possessed more information on Japanese intentions than did Hawaii. And if the preparations by the military commanders in Hawaii were deficient, there would seem to be no justifiable reason why Washington did not put Hawaii on a full alert. Washington ordered such a full alert in June 1940 when the likelihood of war had been infinitely less.[60]

## Winds Signals

Another controversial issue regarding the diplomatic code involved the so-called "winds signals." On November 19, the Japanese announced in their J-19 diplomatic code (a lower level code than "Purple," which United States was able to decode) the setting up of a so-called "Winds System," by which Japanese diplomatic officials and consulates could learn of Tokyo's war intentions in non-coded form (that is, after their code books had been destroyed) in a regular weather forecast broadcast from Tokyo. The key phrase "East Wind Rain" would mean the breaking of diplomatic relations (and probable war) with the United States. The code destruction orders went out on the first and second of December. On December 4, American intelligence picked up the "East Wind Rain" message. This was the so-called "winds execute" message. That American monitors received this message was accepted in the Army and Navy hearings on Pearl Harbor in 1944.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

However, at the time of the Congressional hearings of 1945-46 a major cover-up took place. Authorities claimed that no "winds execute" message had ever been received. And it was true that no messages were around—they had been apparently destroyed. And a number of witnesses who had previously claimed to have seen the message were pressured into recanting. Captain Laurance F. Safford, however, despite intense pressure to change his story, continued to maintain that the "winds execute" message had been intercepted, decoded, and widely distributed.[61]

Crucial confirming evidence for the receipt of "Winds" message was a 1977 interview with Ralph T. Briggs, conducted by the Naval Security Group and declassified by the National Security Agency in March 1980. Briggs said in this interview that he was the one who had intercepted the crucial message, while on duty as chief watch supervisor at the Naval Communication Station at Cheltenham, Maryland. Briggs further stated that he was ordered by his superior officer in 1946 not to testify about the matter to the joint Congressional Committee and to cease any contact with Captain Laurance Safford.[62] In addition, both of the Japanese assistant naval attachés posted at the Washington embassy in 1941 have verified that the message was transmitted on December 4, exactly as Safford said.[63] Defenders of the administration claim that even if this message had been intercepted, it did not really tell anything not already known--that diplomatic relations were to be broken.[64] But if the government would go to such great lengths to cover-up this allegedly harmless evidence, one would expect cover-ups and lies about much more important matters.

## The Last 24 Hours

Finally, there is the question as to what leading officials in Washington were doing in the last 24 hours before the Pearl Harbor attack. Early in the morning of December 6 (Washington time), American intelligence intercepted the so-called "pilot" message, which announced that Japan's response to America's November 26 ultimatum was forthcoming. It would come in 14 parts. The first 13 parts were intercepted and decoded by the early hours of the evening of December 6th, and copies were passed on to the President and to the military and naval chiefs. The harsh language recounting the alleged wrongs done by the United States to Japan clearly pointed to a break in relations. As soon as Franklin D. Roosevelt read the 13 parts, he reportedly told Harry Hopkins that "This means war."[65]

On Sunday morning, the final 14th part of the message was picked up and decoded. It stated that diplomatic relations with the United States were terminated. Ominously, the time of 1:00 P.M. at which the



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Japanese ambassador was instructed to deliver the entire message to Secretary Hull was recognized by the cryptographers as corresponding with a sunrise attack on Pearl Harbor. A number of intelligence officers urged that a warning to be sent to Pearl Harbor. But General George Marshall, who had to authorize the warning, could not be found. Allegedly he was out horseback riding. No warning was sent to Pearl Harbor until it was too late.[66]

The various investigations of the Pearl Harbor attack—by the Army, the Navy, and the Congress—brought out numerous discrepancies in the testimony regarding these last hours, which revisionists have focused upon. Leading figures could not recall where they were at the time. Lesser military figures altered their testimonies to make them fit in with what their superiors wanted. Revisionists see this as part of a conspiracy purposively to withhold critical information from the Pearl Harbor commanders and later to cover-up this operation. As John Toland writes:

> What novelist could persuade a reader to accept the incredible activity during those two days by America's military and civilian leaders? Was it to be believed that the heads of the Army and Navy could not be located on the night before Pearl Harbor? Or that they would later testify over and over that they couldn't remember where they were? Was it plausible that the Chief of Naval Operations, after finally being reminded that he talked to Roosevelt on the telephone that night, could not recall if they had discussed the thirteen-part message. Was it possible to imagine a President who remarked, 'This means war,' after reading the message, not instantly summoning to the White House his Army and Navy commanders as well as his Secretaries of War and Navy? One of Knox's close friends, James G. Stahlman, wrote Admiral Kemp Tolley in 1973 that Knox told him that he, Stimson, Marshall, Stark and Harry Hopkins had spent most of the night of December 6 at the White House with the President: All were waiting for what they knew was coming: an attack on Pearl Harbor.[67]

While establishment historians admit that the Purple intercepts provided the evidence that Japan would make war, they make much of the fact that nothing in the deciphered Japanese diplomatic messages explicitly pinpointed Pearl Harbor as the target. But at that time lower echelon people did perceive that possibility. And the Naval Court of Inquiry, which investigated Pearl Harbor in 1944, maintained:

> In the early forenoon of December 7, Washington time, the War and Navy Departments had information which appeared to indicate that a break in diplomatic relations was imminent and, by inference and deduction, that an attack in the Hawaiian area could be expected soon.[68]



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And what was the rationale for not warning Pearl Harbor even if it were not assumed to be a definite target? Washington had put Hawaii on a full alert in June 1940 with much less justification. It would seem that if Japan were on the verge of war with the United States, a clear warning to Pearl Harbor would have been expected. And the fact of the matter is that there was a considerable amount of additional information beyond the diplomatic messages that pointed to an attack on Pearl Harbor. A convergence of evidence should have been noted.

## Bomb Plot Message

One very important piece of intelligent information pointing to an attack on Pearl Harbor was the so-called "bomb plot message." This consisted of requests from the Japanese government in Tokyo to the Japanese consul-general in Honolulu, Nagoa Kita. One group of messages, beginning in September 1941, divided Pearl Harbor into a grid and directed the Japanese consul in Hawaii to report to Tokyo the locations and number of ships. The Japanese consul's reports were made throughout the fall of 1941 and decoded in Washington. (Washington was also keeping close surveillance on the leading Japanese spy, cover name Tadashi Morimura, who was engaging in this espionage.) This information was popularly referred to as the "bomb plot" messages since a grid is the classic method of planning a bombing attack. There was no need to know exact ship positions unless the purpose was to attack them. None of this information was passed on to the commanders in Hawaii.[69]

Those who have sought to minimize the significance of these "bomb plot" messages have contended that Japanese spies made inquiries at other leading American naval bases, but no such detailed or comprehensive reports, containing as they did grids and coordinates, were demanded of Japanese officials and spies at any other American base in the world. That alone indicated that Hawaii was a special target.

Military intelligence officials realized the significance of the "bomb plot" messages. They were specially marked so their significance could not be missed. The FBI also was following these espionage activities at Pearl Harbor and sending the information to the White House. Roosevelt would have been aware of these activities both through information from naval intelligence and from the FBI.[70] President Roosevelt's personal involvement in this issue was especially demonstrated in his October 1941 meeting with David Sarnoff, president of RCA. Roosevelt arranged to have Sarnoff provide copies of the cables between Tokyo and the Honolulu consulate, which were sent through RCA's Honolulu office, to the Office to Naval Intelligence.[71]



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The most crucial message from the Honolulu consulate was sent to Tokyo on December 3rd. It informed Tokyo that the Japanese spies had set up a system of codes confirming the movement of various American warships through the use of signals in windows at Lanikai Beach, which could be spotted by off-shore Japanese "fishing" boats and submarines. This vital information could then be passed on to the Japanese carrier task force. The signal system would operate through December 6th. Thus, the messages revealed the time of the planned attack.[72]

None of the information of the bomb plot messages was provided to the Hawaii military commanders. The Director of Naval Intelligence, Captain Alan Kirk, was replaced in October 1941, because he insisted on warning Hawaii.[73] It is also noteworthy that the Roosevelt administration allowed such flagrant spying at Pearl Harbor, going against the requests of J. Edgar Hoover to arrest or deport the spies.[74]

## Naval Codes

It has been acknowledged in establishment circles that if the United States government had broken the Japanese naval codes, it would have been aware of the impending attack on Pearl Harbor.[75] Claims have been made that the British and the Dutch had broken the Japanese naval codes. The most prominent individual who has made such a claim is Eric Nave, an Australian officer attached to the Royal Navy, who was one of the actual code-breakers.[76] But mainstream historians have doubted these allegations and have held that American intelligence had not yet broken the Japanese naval codes, especially the leading Japanese naval code, generally called JN-25. In contrast, Robert B. Stinnett contends that American code-breakers were able to read the Japanese naval codes. (Stinnett uses different terminology for the codes, claiming that the name "JN-25" was not in use until after the Pearl Harbor attack.)[77] Stinnett writes:

> Testimony given to various Pearl Harbor investigations suggests that the navy codes were not solved until spring 1942. The author's research proves otherwise. Their solution emerged in the early fall of 1940.[78]

According to Stinnett, American code-breakers were reading the Japanese coded naval communications, called the *Kaigun Ango*, the most important of the codes being the 5-Num (naval operations), SM (naval movement), S (merchant marine), and Yobidashi Fugo (radio call sign) codes. The intercepted messages made it clear that Pearl Harbor would be attacked on December 7, 1941. Stinnett continues: "A sixty-year cover-up has hidden American and Allied success in obtaining the solutions to the *Kaigun Ango* prior to Pearl Harbor. American naval officers hid key code documents from congressional investigators.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Naval intelligence records, deceptively altered, were placed in the US Navy's cryptology files to hide the cryptographic success."[79] Stinnett points out that much of this information is still classified or blacked out in those documents available the public.[80] However, he was able to locate some documents that explicitly show that the naval codes were broken, and he had this confirmed by interviews with surviving code-breakers.[81]

Proponents of the mainstream position categorically reject Stinnett's contention that American code-breakers were reading Japanese naval codes. In a recent article, Stephen Budiansky writes that the United States was unable to read JN-25 or any other high level naval code prior to Pearl Harbor, in part because the Japanese kept changing the code books. By the time the American code-breakers made some headway in breaking a code, the code would be changed to the extent that the code-breakers would have to start over again. It was only after Pearl Harbor that successful decoding took place. All of this is brought out, Budiansky intones, in recently released documents in the National Archives, which provide month-by-month reports on the code-breaking progress of the Navy cryptanalytic office in Washington (known as OP-20-GY) during the entire 1940-1941 period. These monthly reports include the progress of navy decryption units in the Pacific. Budiansky writes:

> The monthly reports filed by OP-20-G confirm that at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack, not a single JN-25 message from the previous 12 months had been read... The reports also confirm only two other Japanese naval code systems being examined seriously before Pearl Harbor, and neither was yielding any results, either.[82]

Budiansky implies that unwary researchers sometimes do not realize that information intercepted in 1941 was not decoded read until 1945-1946.

## Tracking the Fleet

But even if American intelligence had been unable to read the Japanese naval code, Stinnett provides additional information that American monitors had actually tracked the Japanese Pearl Harbor task force by means of radio direction finding techniques. American stations could intercept radio transmissions that enabled trained operators to pinpoint the location of the sender even if the message were indecipherable. The mainstream position has long been that no radio transmissions from the Japanese task force were intercepted after it had begun its movement toward Hawaii. And Japanese naval officials have testified that the fleet was under orders to maintain radio silence.[83]



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Stinnett, however, points out that the order for radio silence from Admiral Yamamoto allowed radio communication in an extreme emergency.

> Radio intercepts obtained by US Navy monitoring stations disclosed that the broadcasts continued after the order was issued. Instead of radio silence there was substantial, continuous radio traffic from the Japanese naval ministry, foreign ministry, and warships.[84]

John Toland had earlier made the claim that the Pearl Harbor task force had been tracked, though with less hard evidence. He wrote that a Dutch naval attaché in Washington, Johan Ranneft, received information at the Office of Naval Intelligence indicating that the Americans knew a Japanese task force was heading toward Hawaii. Ranneft revealed this information in his diary.[85] Also, an American steamship, the Lurline, had picked up the Japanese task force's radio traffic and reported it to the FBI. Finally, Toland cited a seaman in the intelligence office of the 12th Naval District headquarters in San Francisco who had intercepted the Japanese radio traffic and used it to plot the location of the task force as it headed eastward toward Hawaii. This information was supposedly sent on to the White House. Toland initially referred to this individual as "Seaman Z," who was later identified as Robert D. Ogg.[86] What Stinnett provides is documentary evidence to complement and give credence to these eyewitness accounts.

How do these findings mesh with the Japanese claims of radio silence? In essence, Stinnett maintains that ships in the Japanese fleet only engaged in limited radio communication. Radio communication was necessary in order to regroup the task force after a storm had scattered ships beyond visual signaling range. The Japanese were under the impression that low-power frequencies would travel only a few miles and thus be secure from enemy interception. However, a solar storm caused the radio transmissions to travel vast distances, allowing for interception by American listening posts.[87] Furthermore, Stinnett maintains that American monitors were able to determine the location of the Japanese fleet from transmissions to it from shore-based stations in Japan. This involved analysis of the changing radio frequencies. As the distances increased between the ships and the shore transmitters, the radio frequencies, by necessity, changed. Stinnett asserts: "A first day communications intelligence student, aware that Radio Tokyo and Radio Ominato were transmitting to warships could approximate—if not pinpointthe position of the vessels." [88]



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If, as Stinnett claims, the United States had actually tracked the Japanese task force while knowing that Japan was on the verge of war, it would provide conclusive proof that high American officials were aware of the impending attack. And one might add, why would the United States government make the onerous effort to keep tabs on the movement of the Japanese fleet and then not make use of this crucial information? The only counter argument is that Stinnett is completely wrong about the documentary evidence—that no tracking had taken place. And it would seem that Stinnett would be so radically wrong on this issue that it could only be the result of fraud on his part, not simply error.

It should be added that unlike other revisionists Stinnett's argument posits a very large conspiracy that stretched beyond Washington. (In contrast, Barnes, by the 1960s, had limited to conspiracy to Roosevelt and Marshall.)[89] Stinnett goes so far as to maintain that Joseph J. Rochefort, the commander of the cryptographic center at Pearl Harbor, and Edwin Layton, the Pacific Fleet's chief security officer, were aware of the approaching Japanese fleet and refrained from warning Kimmel. This tends to stretch credulity. However, Stinnett does cite documentary evidence, which, though ridiculed by proponents of the mainstream position, has not been directly refuted.[90]

Revisionist Mark Willey puts forth an argument that would keep Hawaii intelligence out of the conspiracy loop. Willey points out that it requires two bearings to determine the location of radio transmissions, while Hawaii had only one. He claims that Hawaii was deliberately sent false cross-bearings that precluded accurate tracking.[91]

## POPOV'S WARNING

In addition to the American code-breaking, revisionists have cited a number of other warnings of the impending attack on Pearl Harbor that were provided to the United States government. One of the most intriguing came from Dusko Popov, a Serb who worked as a double agent for both Germany and Britain. Popov's true sympathies, however, were with the Allies. Popov was also a notorious playboy, who was code-named "Tricycle" because of his proclivity for bedding two women simultaneously. It is reputed that Popov was Ian Fleming's model for James Bond.[92]

In the summer of 1941, Germany sent Popov to the United States to establish an espionage cadre. Popov's instructions were contained in an questionnaire miniaturized to microdots, which could only be read by a microscope. The instructions asked Popov and his subordinates to obtain information about American war material production and, more ominously, called for a detailed study of Pearl Harbor and its nearby airfields. Popov learned from a German spy that the Japanese needed



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this information for their planned attack on Pearl Harbor before the end of 1941. Popov made this information known to his British handlers, and the British had him provide this information to the FBI when he came to America in August 1941.[93]

It has been argued that the FBI did not trust Popov's information and the microdots, and did not fully transmit it to the White House. One explanation is that the prudish J. Edgar Hoover gave little credibility to Popov's information because of his distaste for his playboy lifestyle.[94] However, documents the FBI released in 1983 show that it assigned considerable importance to Popov's information and that this information was passed on to high ranking officers in Army and Naval intelligence. In Frank Paul Mintz's analysis of the FBI material on Popov, he found that much of the information had been blackened out, so it would be impossible to know that the important parts were not transmitted to the military intelligence and the White House.[95] As Mintz concludes:

> It passes credibility to assume that the microdot questionnaire remained effectively dead to the world in 1941. English intelligence knew about it; the FBI knew; and so did the intelligence services of U.S. armed forces. Most likely both Churchill and Roosevelt became familiar with the full contents of Popov's microdots during the last quarter of the year.[96]

## Other Warnings

On January 27, 1941, Dr. Ricardo Shreiber, the Peruvian envoy in Tokyo, told Max Bishop, third secretary of the United States embassy, that he had just learned from his intelligence sources that there was a Japanese war plan involving a surprise attack on Pearl Harbor. After being presented to Ambassador Joseph Grew, this information was sent to the State Department, where it was read by Secretary of State Cordell Hull and Naval Intelligence. Arthur McCollum of Naval Intelligence, Roosevelt's close confidante according to Stinnett, sent a cable on this issue to Kimmel, with the analysis that "The Division of Naval Intelligence places no credence in these rumors" and that "no move against Pearl Harbor appears imminent or planned for the foreseeable future."[97] In contrast to the reaction of Naval Intelligence, Ambassador Grew was much impressed by the information. As he wrote in his diary:

> There is a lot of talk around town to the effect that the Japanese, in case of a break with the United States, are planning to go all out in a surprise mass attack on Pearl Harbor. I rather guess that the boys in Hawaii are not precisely asleep.[98]

The American ambassador was not the only source from Japan providing warnings of the impending attack. Early in the fall of 1941,



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kilsoo Haan, a Korean agent-lobbyist in Washington, told Eric Severeid of CBS that the Korean sources in Korea and Japan had proof that the Japanese were going to attack Pearl Harbor before Christmas. In late October, Haan finally convinced Senator Guy Gillette of Iowa that the Japanese were planning to attack Pearl Harbor. Gillette alerted the State Department, Army and Navy Intelligence, and President Roosevelt personally. Stanley K. Hornbeck, then the number three-man at the State Department and an intimate of Henry Stimson, wrote a memorandum to Secretary of State Hull stating that Haan's Pearl Harbor warning should be taken seriously.[99]

In early December 1941, the Dutch Army in Java succeeded in decoding a dispatch from Tokyo to its Bangkok embassy, referring to planned Japanese attacks on the Philippines and Hawaii. The Dutch passed the information on to Brigadier General Elliot Thorpe, the U.S. military observer. Thorpe found this information so disturbing that he sent Washington a total of four warnings, the last one going to General Marshall's intelligence chief. Thorpe's message was acknowledged and he was ordered to send no further messages concerning the matter. The Dutch also had their Washington military attaché, Colonel F. G. L. Weijerman, personally warn General Marshall.[100]

Dr. Hans Thomsen, the German *charge d'affaires* in Washington, who was anti-Nazi, told Colonel William J. Donovan, American intelligence chief (and later head of the OSS), that the Germans intended to attack Pearl Harbor. This information was put into a memorandum. It is hard to believe that Donovan would not have brought this to Roosevelt's attention since he conferred with him several times in November and early December 1941.[101]

According to Congressman Martin Dies, his House Un-American Activities Committee's investigation into Japanese intelligence activities in 1941 had uncovered a map and other documents providing "precise information of the proposed attack" on Pearl Harbor. When Dies informed Secretary of State Hull, he was told to keep quiet on the matter because of "extremely delicate" relations between Japan and the United States. Dies claimed that representatives from the State Department and the Army and Navy inspected the map.[102]

## Revelations of Knowledge About the Attack

Revisionists also cite a number of revelations that officials of the United States government, including Roosevelt, had prior knowledge of the Pearl Harbor attack. In his November 15, 1941, secret press briefing, Marshall told his audience that the United States had information derived from encrypted Japanese messages that war between the United States and Japan would break out during the first ten days of



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

December. Although Marshall apparently did not specifically mention Pearl Harbor, his reference to the cracked codes implied that American intelligence would have been aware of the location of the impending attack.[103]

Colonel Carleton Ketchum substantiates J. Edgar Hoover's claim that Roosevelt knew of the Japanese plans to attack Pearl Harbor. According to Ketchum, at the behest of Congressmen George Bender of Ohio, he attended a private meeting of a select group of congressmen and government officials in Washington in early 1942 at which J. Edgar Hoover referred to various warnings of the attack on Pearl Harbor that he had passed on to FDR. Hoover also said that Roosevelt had received information on the impending attack from other sources. Hoover was allegedly told by Roosevelt to keep quiet on that matter. Ketchum said that before Hoover spoke, the group was reminded of their usual pledge of secrecy (confidential matters were supposedly often discussed before the group), but that Ketchum believed that since the release of Toland's *Infamy* in 1982, which discussed similar matters, he was freed of his pledge of secrecy. Ketchum had referred to this meeting and the talk on Pearl Harbor in general terms in his 1976 autobiography, in which he stated that he still observed his pledge of silence on the specifics of what was discussed. It was this earlier reference that helps to give Ketchum's later statement regarding Hoover's actual message some credibility.[104]

In an oral history, John A. Burns, a governor of Hawaii, said that while he was a police officer on the Honolulu force, an FBI agent informed him in early December 1941 of the impending attack on Pearl Harbor. Other witnesses identified the agent as Robert Shivers.[105]

## Joseph Leib's Account

One of the most fascinating revelations comes from Joe Leib, a newspaper reporter who had formerly held posts in the Roosevelt administration. Leib claimed that his friend, Secretary of State Cordell Hull, confided to him on November 29, 1941 that President Roosevelt knew that the Japanese were going to attack Pearl Harbor within a few days, and that the President was going to let this happen as a way to get the country into war. Hull was strongly opposed to this scheme. He turned over to Leib a document containing a transcript of Japanese radio intercepts which allegedly concerned the Pearl Harbor plan. While making Leib promise never to reveal his source, Hull urged him to take the story to the press. Leib took the story to the United Press bureau, which it refused to run it. Although Leib did manage to get a version of it placed onto United Press's foreign cable, only one newspaper took it,



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the *Honolulu Advertiser*, which created a front-page banner headline in its Sunday, November 30 issue: "Japanese May Strike Over Weekend."[106]

## Roosevelt and the Red Cross

A recent Pearl Harbor investigator, Daryl S. Borgquist, contends that Don C. Smith, who directed War Services for the Red Cross before WWII, was told by Roosevelt in November 1941 to prepare secretly for an impending Japanese attack on Hawaii. This story came to light in a 1995 letter from Smith's daughter, Helen C. Hamman, to President Clinton dealing with the issue of the culpability of Admiral Kimmel and General Short, which was then being reconsidered by the United States government. Roosevelt, Ms. Hamman wrote, told her father that he was to keep this effort secret from the military personnel on Hawaii. Roosevelt said that "the American people would never agree to enter the war in Europe unless they were attack [sic] within their own borders." Borquist was able to confirm the basics of Hamman's story--the Red Cross did quietly send large quantities of medical supplies and experienced medical personnel to Hawaii shortly before December 7, 1941.[107]

## Conclusion

How is one to evaluate the various parts of the revisionist position? The evidence would seem to be clear that Roosevelt provoked the Japanese to attack the United States. It is apparent that the U.S. could have taken alternative policies aimed at the preservation of peace. And given the threat the United States posed to Japan in its very own geographical region, it was quite understandable that Japan would strike at the United States. Moreover, American government officials clearly recognized that the American policies would push Japan into belligerency. Furthermore, it seems clear that Roosevelt desired a Japanese attack on an American territory or ship in order to galvanize public support behind a declaration of war that would enable him to honor his commitments in the ADB agreement.

Nevertheless, some qualifications are necessary. It is not as apparent, or necessary for the revisionist thesis, that Roosevelt was following some rigid plan to achieve war with Japan going back to the first part of 1940, as some hard revisionists such as Stinnett maintain. It is quite conceivable that at times Roosevelt considered maintaining peace with the Japanese so as to focus on the European war. Moreover, it does not seem to have been in Roosevelt's character to have a perfectly consistent policy—certainly this was the case in his domestic policy. As revisionist Frederic Sanborn opines:

> Therefore it may be true that there was a complex ambivalence, not thoroughly thought out, in Mr. Roosevelt's attitude toward the expedience of peace or war with Japan. It is quite possible that



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> he did not fully commit himself to the latter choice until late in November 1941. By his own express declarations we know that he deliberately temporized. Temporizing is sometimes merely a way to postpone making a decision, but it may also be a method of awaiting a favorable opportunity to put into effect a decision already made.[108]

That Roosevelt had foreknowledge of a Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor requires some qualification. It is likely that not all failures to see the impending attack on Pearl Harbor were the result of conspiracy. As Harry Elmer Barnes realized, part of the reason for the failure of official Washington to alert Hawaii was its fixation on Japanese troop movements in the Southeast East Asia because of the implications this had on the ADB agreement.[109]

Also as late as the first days of December, there seems to have been extreme nervousness among Roosevelt and his inner circle that the Japanese might avoid attacking American territory. Certainly, the British government seemed to be of this opinion in its effort to get assurances from the United States that it would honor its commitment to fight the Japanese when they moved southward.[110] And, of course, why would Roosevelt try to arrange an incident with the three little ships if he knew the Japanese would attack Pearl Harbor? Perhaps, Roosevelt was aware of the possibility of the attack on Pearl Harbor but lacked certitude. Then again, as Harry Elmer Barnes implied, perhaps Roosevelt sought to save the fleet by getting the United States into the war earlier through an incident involving the little ships.

But while Roosevelt might not have been certain of the Pearl Harbor attack, it would seem that he was at least aware of its likelihood. There is just too much converging evidence to conclude otherwise—that the attack on Pearl Harbor took Roosevelt completely by surprise. Perhaps, some of this evidence can be questioned, but it is hard to question all of it. Even before the new information provided by Stinnett became known, Frank Paul Mintz concluded that "the 'argument from saturation' is the most persuasive one in behalf of the contention that Washington was forewarned."[111] If the information provided by Stinnett is accurate—that the United States actually was reading the Japanese naval codes and was tracking the task force as it moved toward Hawaii— it would by itself be sufficient to prove the revisionist case.

Of course, a number of arguments (some mutually exclusive) have been used to criticize the overall revisionist position. (Earlier in this essay, criticisms of specific revisionist points have been noted and countered.) One of the mildest deals with the idea that while the agencies of the United States collected information that would show that Pearl Harbor was a target, such information was not in Roosevelt's hands.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

However, Roosevelt was actively involved in American foreign policy decision-making, so it would seem hard to believe that he would be uninformed regarding intelligence issues. And as discussed earlier in this essay, Stinnett points out that Roosevelt was given access to, and was interested in, specific intelligence information regarding Pearl Harbor.

A more fundamental criticism of the revisionist position relies on an argument made by Roberta Wohlstetter in *Pearl Harbor: Warning and Decisions*[112] that claims that American intelligence was so overwhelmed with information, which she refers to as "noise," that it could not make an accurate evaluation. Wohlstetter acknowledges that in hindsight one could see that information pointed to a Japanese attack, but that before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor it was impossible to select out the valid information, which was "imbedded in an atmosphere of 'noise.'"[113] However, it is hard to see how this could be an insurmountable problem for intelligence gatherers. Being able to select the wheat from the chaff is their fundamental function. "Noise" would exist in any intelligence situation. It is not apparent that the situation American intelligence faced in 1941 was vastly more complicated than what is normally the case.

Prange, Goldstein, and Dillon write that in a "thorough search of more than thirty years, including all publications released up to May 1, 1981 we have not discovered one document or one word of sworn testimony that substantiates the revisionist position on Roosevelt and Pearl Harbor."[114] One wonders what the authors mean here. Certainly, there is evidence for the revisionist case.. If Goldstein and Dillon[115] use the term "substantiate" to mean something like absolute proof, it must be admitted that no one document, to date, absolutely proves the revisionist case. But then again a single document rarely "proves" any historical argument. It is numerous pieces of evidence that point to one conclusion. Michael Shermer makes use of this "convergence of evidence" argument to prove that the Holocaust happened and for historical proof in general.[116] It would certainly seem to be applicable to Pearl Harbor. And this argument meshes with Mintz's "argument from saturation."

Another criticism of the revisionist position is the rejection of the possibility of a successful conspiracy. Prange, Goldstein, and Dillon assume that such a conspiracy would have had to have encompassed a large number of individuals.

> To accept the revisionist position, one must assume that almost every one of those individuals, from the President on down, was a traitor. Somewhere along the line someone would have recalled his solemn oath to defend the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and have blown the whistle.[117]



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But there is no need to assume a massive conspiracy because its actions were extremely limited—the conspirators simply refrained from sending necessary information to Hawaii. And there is no reason to assume that the members of Roosevelt's inner circle would ever publicly confess to this operation because instead of regarding their action as traitorous, they undoubtedly believed that they were acting for the good of the country.

Other arguments against the revisionist thesis make assumptions about Roosevelt's character—that he was too humanitarian to sacrifice American lives. Dillon and Goldstein, for example, write that "nothing in his history suggests that this man could plot to sink American ships and kill thousands of American soldiers and sailors."[118]

But, as demonstrated by his efforts to get into the war, Roosevelt, like many other leaders considered great, was not squeamish about the loss of lives to achieve a higher good. And contrary to the Goldstein and Dillon scenario, revisionists do not accuse Roosevelt of actively plotting to kill Americans. He simply allowed the attack to take place. Moreover, as pointed out earlier, Roosevelt could have reasonably expected the damage to have been much less than it was. According to the conventional wisdom of the day, the battleships in Pearl Harbor were virtually invulnerable to air attack and the harbor was too shallow for torpedoes to be effective.[119]

A related argument assumes that allowing the fleet to be destroyed was just too much of a risk for Roosevelt to have taken. But leaders considered "great" have been known for taking risks--think of Napoleon, or Alexander the Great. And the American risk was actually not that great considering what Roosevelt thought to be the alternative if the United States did not enter the war—Axis domination of the world that would imperil the United States. Moreover, because of the anti-war stance of the American public, Roosevelt realistically believed that only an overt attack on the United States could generate the necessary public support for war. Thus, from Roosevelt's point of view, only an attack on the United States would enable to United States to take the necessary step—i.e., war—for its survival. Any risk would be worth it—somewhat like the risk a terminal cancer patient takes in having a serious, even experimental operation, in order to stave off an otherwise unavoidable death. But again there was no reason for Roosevelt to regard the risk to be of any great magnitude—certainly the security of continental United States was not endangered. Moreover, as pointed out earlier, Roosevelt could have reasonably expected the damage to have been much less than it was. And Japan was not perceived as an all-powerful foe. Once the Allies, which included the Soviet Union, had taken care of the greatest danger—Germany—it could reasonably be assumed that they could easily defeat Japan.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Henry Stimson revealed in his diary that the White House proponents of war could see the positive results of the Pearl Harbor attack from the very outset:

> When the news first came that Japan had attacked us my first feeling was of relief that the indecision was over and that a crisis had come in a way which would unite all our people. This continued to be my dominant feeling in spite of the news of catastrophes, which quickly developed. For I feel that this country united has practically nothing to fear; while the apathy and divisions stirred up by unpatriotic men had been hitherto very discouraging.[120]

Finally, many mainstream historians, instead of writing with any type of detachment, have closely identified with World War II as the "good war," and are automatically hostile to any ideas that might tarnish this image. This is quite apparent in Prange, Goldstein, and Dillon, who refer to the Allies as the "free world" even when Stalinist Russia is included. Ultimately, Prange, Goldstein, and Dillon view the revisionists as not simply producing erroneous history but as posing a deliberate threat to human freedom. Prange, Goldstein, and Dillon write:

> We would not devote so much space to it [the revisionist interpretation] except for two frightening aspects. First, such disregard for the laws of evidence undermines the structure of Occidental justice, so laboriously erected over the centuries. If contemporary documents and sworn testimony can be disregarded in favor of unsupported charges and personal venom, no citizen is safe... It also recalls uncomfortably the notion so widespread among the Germans after World War I, and such a favorite thesis with Hitler, that Germany did not really suffer military defeat, but had been stabbed in the back by politicians on the home front.[121]

Thus, Prange, Goldstein, and Dillon connect Pearl Harbor revisionism with Nazism. The emotionalism evident in such thinking can easily distort their writing. In short, they judge the revisionist account by much higher standards of proof than are conventionally applied to historical events.

It can be wondered what could possibly constitute proof of the revisionist argument that could satisfy adherents of the establishment position. It should be noted that in rejecting the revisionist thesis mainstream historians are quite willing to abandon establishment arguments fervently held in the past. For example, John Prados, a proponent of the mainstream position, actually accepts Stinnett's contention that the Japanese fleet approaching Hawaii did not maintain radio silence and that American intelligence monitored its radio transmissions. Now the radio silence argument had been a bulwark of the mainstream position to explain why the Japanese task force could



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reach Pearl Harbor undetected. The fact that the mainstream historians might have been completely wrong on this crucial point, however, does not cause Prados to consider the idea that the revisionists might be right in their overall view. Rather, Prados goes on to chastise Stinnett for,

> attributing every failure to a nefarious 'plan,' giving no attention to the ambitions of certain Navy officers who wanted to dominate all intelligence, operations and communications services to the fleet... and their plan was not a conspiracy to get the United States into World War II.[122]

But what evidence would be necessary to prove the revisionist thesis? It appears that for some establishment thinkers no type of evidence would provide sufficient proof. Certainly, Prados' argument allows for a pre-emptive rejection of revisionism even if the revisionist contention that American intelligence could read the Japanese naval codes would be accepted as true.

As revisionist James J. Martin aptly points out:

> There are never enough data to enable one to *prove* an unpopular historical thesis. An establishment, having anchored its lines, predictably vilifies a rival and subjects those involved to ridicule and ultimately to personal detraction and traducement which goes far beyond that. This *ad hominem* denigration is expected to transfer to their intellectual product. And no matter what the latter put on the record, the former insist that it is not enough 'proof,' regardless of how flimsy or unconvincing was the 'proof' used to create the establishment position.[123]

Pre-conceived ideas generally control historical observations. Historians, especially those who make their living in academic circles, must necessarily work within the paradigmatic confines of the prevailing orthodoxy, especially where taboo topics are involved. The heretic must labor on the scholarly fringes, with little or no financial backing and no major avenues for dissemination. Perhaps this would be considered a tautology, but it is likely that the revisionist account of Pearl Harbor and the origins of the war with Japan can never receive a fair hearing in mainstream circles until the presentation of World War II as the "good war" is no longer of great instrumental value to the reigning establishment.[124] Obviously, the "good war" scenario still serves a vital purpose as America, victorious over the mighty Taliban, marches forward to make the world safe from "terrorism."

---

*Stephen J. Sniegoski holds a Ph.D. in American diplomatic history and is the author of several historical articles.*

---



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## ENDNOTES

1. Gordon Prange with Donald M. Goldstein and Katherine V. Dillon, *Pearl Harbor: The Verdict of History* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1986), p. 40.

2. Frank P. Mintz, *Revisionism and the Origins of Pearl Harbor* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1985).

3. Ibid., p. 81.

4. For example, British historian Antony Best writes: "In particular, it is important to see how the restrictive trading practices which the British Empire introduced to buttress British industries during the Depression, such as imperial preference and quotas on Japanese exports, pushed Japan towards the desire for autarky and the establishment of a yen bloc, and thus expansionism in East Asia." *Britain, Japan and Pearl Harbor: Avoiding War in East Asia, 1936-41* (London: LSE/Routledge, 1995), p. 3.

5. Charles C. Tansill, *Back Door to War: The Roosevelt Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1952), p. 96.

6. Anthony Kubek, *How the Far East Was Lost: American Policy and the Creation of Communist China, 1941-1949* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1963), p. 3.

7. Bruce M. Russett, *No Clear and Present Danger: A Skeptical View of the U.S. Entry into World War II* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1972), p. 57.

8. Robert B. Stinnett, *Day of Deceit: The Truth About FDR and Pearl Harbor* (New York: The Free Press, 2000), pp. 8-9.

9. Wayne S. Cole, *An Interpretive History of American Foreign Relations*. Revised edition. (Homewood, Il.: Dorsey Press, 1974), p. 377.

10. Robert Smith Thompson, *A Time for War: Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Path to Pearl Harbor* (New York: Prentice Hall Press, 1991), pp. 322-23.

11. Jonathan G. Utley, *Going to War with Japan, 1933-1941* (Knoxville, Tn.: University of Tennessee Press, 1985), pp. 34-35.

12. Prange, *Pearl Harbor: The Verdict of History*, pp. 70-71.

13. Herbert Feis, *The Road to Pearl Harbor: The Coming of the War Between the United States and Japan* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1950), p. 170.

14. James J. Martin, "Pearl Harbor: Antecedents, Background and Consequences," [http://www.blancmange.net/tmh/articles/pearl.html].

15. John Costello, *Days of Infamy: MacArthur, Roosevelt, Churchill--The Shocking Truth Revealed* (New York: Pocket Books, 1994), p. 146.

16. Thompson, p. 366.

17. Ibid., pp. 365-366.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

18. Stinnett, pp. 9-10.

19. This argument has been made that Roosevelt did not intend the freeze on assets to be a complete embargo but that the latter was brought about by anti-Japanese officials in the State Department led by Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson. See Utley, pp. 153-54. This argument is difficult to accept. That Roosevelt made some early statements implying that the embargo would not be total can be seen as an effort to counter those who complained that such an embargo would inevitably lead to war. If the full embargo were a mistake, Roosevelt could have easily rectified it. Certainly, Roosevelt was aware of the effects on Japanese and their belligerent reaction to the embargo.

20. Quoted in Costello, p. 59.

21. George Morgenstern, *Pearl Harbor: The Story of the Secret War* (New York: Devin-Adair Company, 1947), p. 147

22. Quoted in Morgenstern, *Pearl Harbor*, p. 148.

23. Morgenstern, *Pearl Harbor* , p. 11.

24. Quoted in Bruce R. Bartlett, *Cover-Up: The Politics of Pearl Harbor, 1941-1946* (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House Publishers, 1978), p. 38.

25. Bruce M. Russet, *No Clear and Present Danger: A Skeptical View of the United States Entry into World War II* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1972), p. 53.

26. Thompson, pp. 366, 375.

27. Ibid., pp. 375-77.

28. Russett, p. 53.

29. Kemp Tolley, *Cruise of the Lanikai: Incitement to War* (Annapolis, Md.: Naval Institute Press, 1973), p. 40; Morgenstern, *Pearl Harbor*, p. 115.

30. Thompson, p. 352.

31. Ibid., p. 379.

32. Russett, p. 54.

33. Morgenstern, *Pearl Harbor*, p. 140.

34. Ibid., *Pearl Harbor*, pp. 150-52.

35. John Berlau, "'Red' Alert at Pearl Harbor," *Insight Magazine*, [http://www.insightmag.com/archive/200106185.shtml].

36. Harry Elmer Barnes, *Pearl Harbor After a Quarter of a Century* (New York: Arno Press, 1972), p.76.

37. Basil Rauch, *Roosevelt, from Munich to Pearl Harbor: A Study in the Creation of a Foreign Policy* (New York: Creative Age Press, 1950), p. 472.

38. Kubek, pp. 108, 111.

39. Paul W. Schroeder writes: "For those who believe that a vital moral difference existed between the two cases, the problem would seem to be how to show that it is morally unjustifiable to violate principle in order to keep a potential enemy out of a war, yet morally justifiable to sacrifice principle in order to get a potential ally into it. The dilemma appears insoluble." *The Axis Alliance and Japanese-American Relations: 1941* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1958), p. 210.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

40. Wayne S. Cole, *Roosevelt and the Interventionists* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983), p. 444.

41. Cole, *Roosevelt and the Interventionists*, p. 447.

42. Harold L. Ickes, *The Secret Diary of Harold L. Ickes: The Lowering Clouds, 1939-1941* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954), p. 630 quoted in Bartlett, *Cover-up*, p. 20.

43. Thomas Fleming, *The New Dealers' War: F. D. R. and the War Within World War II* (New York: Basic Books, 2001), pp. 34-35.

44. Fleming, pp. 34-35. Historians have added that America's secret war plan for attacking German-occupied Europe, which was leaked to the press in early December 1941, helped to motivate his Hitler's decision for war. Fleming thinks that Roosevelt intentionally leaked the secret war plan in order to bring about this desired result.

45. Barnes, *Pearl Harbor after a Quarter of a Century*, p. 108.

46. Costello, p. 146.

47. Quoted in Charles A. Beard, *President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War, 1941: A Study in Appearances and Realities* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1948), p. 517.

48. Bartlett, pp. 57-59; John Toland, *Infamy: Pearl Harbor and Its Aftermath* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1982), pp. 291-92.

49. Fleming, p. 24.

50. Fleming, p. 47; Costello, pp. 146-47; A first hand account of this episode is provided by Tolley, pp. 268-80.

51. An alternative explanation in Gordon Prange's *At Dawn We Slept:The Untold Story of Pearl Harbor* (New York: Penguin Books, 1981) is that Roosevelt's order simply reflected his "indestructible faith in small crafts." (p. 848). This explanation, which presents Roosevelt as a somewhat irrational busybody, is far from convincing.

52. Edward T. Layton with Roger Pineau and John Costello, *And I Was There: Pearl Harbor and Midway—Breaking the Secrets*, p. 247.

53. Barnes, *Pearl Harbor After a Quarter of a Century*, p. 90.

54. Henry C. Clausen and Bruce Lee, *Pearl Harbor: Final Judgment* (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1992), pp. 154-56.

55. Quoted in Clausen, p. 156.

56. George Morgenstern, "The Actual Road to Pearl Harbor," in *Perpetual War For Perpetual Peace*, edited by Harry Elmer Barnes (Caldwell, Idaho: Caxton Printers, Ltd., 1953), pp. 352.

57. Barnes, *Pearl Harbor After a Quarter of a Century*, pp. 48-57; Morgenstern, "The Actual Road to Pearl Harbor," pp. 352-54.

58. Quoted in Barnes, *Pearl Harbor After a Quarter of a Century*, p. 60.

59. Stinnett, pp. 144-45.

60. Morgenstern, *Pearl Harbor*, pp. 246, 255.

61. Toland, *Infamy*, pp. 208-217, 244-45.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

62. Ibid, pp. 195-98; 322-23.

63. John Toland, "Postscript," *Infamy: Pearl Harbor and its Aftermath* [Paperback] (New York: Berkley Books, 1983), pp. 346-47.

64. Prange, *At Dawn We Slept*, p. 361.

65. Toland, *Infamy*, p. 5.

66. Barnes, *Pearl Harbor: After a Quarter of a Century*, pp. 37-40.

67. Toland, *Infamy*, p. 320.

68. Naval Court of Inquiry, p. 69 quoted in Morgenstern, *Pearl Harbor*, p. 244.

69. Stinnett, pp. 83-107.

70. Ibid., p. 101.

71. Ibid., pp. 106-107.

72. Charles Lutton, "Pearl Harbor: Fifty Years of Controversy," *Journal of Historical Review*. http://www.vho.org/GB/Journals/JHR/11/4/Lutton431-467.html.

73. Toland, *Infamy*, p. 63.

74. Stinnett, p. 97.

75. Frederick D. Parker, "The Unsolved Messages of Pearl Harbor," *Cryptologia* 15 (October 1991), pp. 295-313.

76. See for example: James Rusbridger and Eric Nave, *Betrayal at Pearl Harbor: How Churchill Lured Roosevelt into WWII* (New York: Summit Books, 1991).

77. Author's telephone conversation with Robert B. Stinnett on July 30, 2001.

78. Stinnett, p. 22.

79. Ibid., p. 71.

80. Ibid., p. 82.

81. In the author's telephone conversation with Robert B. Stinnett on July 27, 2001, he emphatically stated that documents explicitly noting the reading of the Japanese naval codes in late 1941 exist in the National Archives in College Park, Maryland.

82. Stephen Budiansky, "Too Late for Pearl Harbor," *U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, December 1999, pp. 47-51 [http://www.usni.org/Proceedings/Articles99/PRObdiansky.htm].

83. Prange, *Pearl Harbor: The Verdict of History*, pp. 54-55.

84. Stinnett, p. 124.

85. Toland, *Infamy*, pp. 298-99.

86. Ibid., pp. 278-80, 285-86; Roy Davis, BBC, *Sacrifice at Pearl Harbor*, 1989 (Television documentary).

87. Stinnett, p. 205;

88. Ibid., Footnote 37, p. 367.

89. Mintz, pp. 96-97.

90. Especially see, Robert B. Stinnett, "Afterward to the Paperback Edition," *Day of Deceit: The Truth About FDR and Pearl Harbor* (New York: Touchstone, 2001), pp. 261-70.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

91. Mark Emerson Willey, *Pearl Harbor: Mother of All Conspiracies* (NP: NP, 200), p. 196.

92. Dusko Popov, *Spy/Counterspy: The Autobiography of Dusko Popov* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1974).

93. Toland, *Infamy*, pp. 258-60; Mintz, pp. 97-98.

94. John F. Bratzel and Leslie B. Rout, Jr., "Pearl Harbor, Microdots, and J. Edgar Hoover," *American Historical Review* 87 (Dec. 1982): 1342-1351.

95. Telephone interview with Frank P. Mintz on July 31, 2001. Mintz reviewed the Popov documents at the FBI building.

96. Mintz, p. 100. In a telephone conversation with the author on July 29, 2001, Mintz said that most of the FBI documents dealing with Popov that are available to the public have large segments blacked out.

97. Stinnett, pp. 31-32.

98. Toland, *Infamy*, p. 253.

99. Ibid., *Infamy*, pp. 260-61, 289-90, 311; Toland, "Postscript," pp. 349-50; Thompson, pp. 370-71.

100. Toland, *Infamy*, pp. 281-82, 291.

101. Thompson, p. 383.

102. Martin Dies, *Martin Dies Story* (New York: Bookmailer, 1963), p. 165.

103. Stinnett, pp. 157-58.

104. Toland, "Postscript," p. 342-44. Ketchum had referred to this meeting and the talk on Pearl Harbor in general terms in his 1976 autobiography, in which he stated that he still observed his pledge of silence on the specifics.

105. Toland, "Postscript," p. 345.

106. Davis, BBC, *Sacrifice*.

107. Daryl S. Borgquist, "Advance Warning? The Red Cross Connection," *Naval History*, 13:3 (May/June, 1999), [http://www.usni.org/navalhistory/Articles99/NHborgquist.htm].

108. Frederic R. Sanborn, "Roosevelt is Frustrated in Europe," in Barnes, ed., *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace*, p. 221.

109. Mintz, p. 38.

110. Costello, pp. 326-27.

111. Mintz, p. 101.

112. Roberta Wohlstetter, *Pearl Harbor: Warning and Decision* (Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1962).

113. Ibid., p. 387.

114. Prange, *Pearl Harbor: The Verdict of History*, p. 850.

115. Prange was deceased when this part was written.

116. Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman, *Denying History: Who Says the Holocaust Didn't Happen and Why Do They Say It?* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

117. Prange, *Pearl Harbor: The Verdict of History*, p. 64.

118. Ibid., p. 64.

119. Toland, "Postscript", p. 348.

120. Morgenstern, *Pearl Harbor*, p. 309.

121. Prange, *Pearl Harbor: The Verdict of History*, p. 39.

122. John Prados, "Rumors of War," Review of *Day of Deceit*_ by Robert Stinnett in "Book World," *Washington Post*, March 5, 2000, p. X-7.

123. Martin, "Pearl Harbor."

124. This could be interpreted as a "paradigm" shift, a term made famous by Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# The Western Contribution to World History

James C. Russell

---

"I shall begin by speaking about our ancestors, since it is only right and proper on such an occasion to pay them the honor of recalling what they did." Thus wrote Thucydides in his *History of the Peloponnesian War*[1] and so it is fitting to pay tribute to those whose deeds contributed toward the creation and defense of our Western Civilization. The deeds of our ancestors, which we have chosen to commemorate today, include those of a military, cultural and scientific nature.

In his book entitled *The Birth of Europe*, medieval historian Robert Lopez posed the question: "What enabled Europe to emerge finally on top?" His answer was "the absence of great invasions for a thousand years."[2] Hence we begin our survey of Western contributions by paying tribute to those who, throughout the history of the West, courageously repulsed alien invading forces.

The first great battle for the survival of the West occurred nearly 2,500 years ago, in 480 B.C. in Greece. Herodotus, the first great Western historian, describes this legendary battle in his *History of the Persian War*. When the Persians invaded Greece, the Greeks realized that they were outnumbered and needed time to reorganize their forces. They sought to delay the approaching Persians at a narrow mountain pass. The following selection describes a scenario not unlike that which confronts us today: the fear and resignation of the many, the outright treason of some, and the sacrifice of the few who fight valiantly against insurmountable odds. Herodotus wrote:

> [7.207] The Greek forces at Thermopylae, when the Persian army drew near to the entrance of the pass, were seized with fear; and a council was held to consider a retreat. It was the wish of the Greeks generally that the army should fall back. But Leonidas, the Spartan King, gave his voice for remaining where they were.
>
> [7.210] Four whole days went by, and Xerxes, the Persian king, expected that the Greeks would run away. When, however, he found on the fifth day that they were not gone, thinking that their firm stand was mere impudence and recklessness, he grew angry,



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> and sent against them the Medes and Cissians, with orders to take them alive and bring them into his presence. Then the Medes rushed forward and charged the Greeks, but fell in vast numbers.
>
> [7.212] During these assaults, it is said that Xerxes, who was watching the battle, thrice leaped from the throne on which he sat, in terror for his army. Next day the combat was renewed, but with no better success on the part of the Persians.
>
> [7.213] Now, as the Persian king was in great distress, and knew not how he should deal with the emergency, Ephialtes, the son of Eurydemus, a Greek, came to him and was admitted to a conference. Hoping to receive a rich reward at the king's hands, he had come to tell him of a pathway which led across the mountain to Thermopylae. By this disclosure he brought destruction on the band of his fellow Greeks who had previously withstood the Persians.
>
> [7.219] The news came that the Persians were marching round by the hills: it was still night when these men arrived. Then the Greeks held a council to consider what they should do, and here opinions were divided: some were strong against quitting their post, while others contended to the contrary. So when the council had broken up, part of the troops departed and went their ways homeward to their several states; part however resolved to remain, and to stand by Leonidas to the last.
>
> [7.223] The Persians under Xerxes began to draw near; and the Greeks under Leonidas, as they now went forth determined to die, advanced much further than on previous days.... Now they took the battle beyond the wall, and carried slaughter among the Persians, who fell in heaps.
>
> [7.224] Leonidas himself fell fighting bravely, together with many other famous Spartans, whose names I have taken care to learn on account of their great worthiness, as indeed I have the names of all the three hundred.
>
> [7.225] Drawing back into the narrowest part of the pass, and retreating even behind the wall, they posted themselves upon a hill, where they stood all drawn up together in one close body.... The hill whereof I speak is at the entrance of the pass, where the stone lion now stands which was set up in honour of Leonidas. Here the Greeks defended themselves to the last, such as still had swords using them, and the others resisting with their hands and teeth; till the Persians, who... now encircled them upon every side, overwhelmed and buried the remnant... beneath showers of arrows.

This inspirational sacrifice of our ancient ancestors at Thermopylae led to a Greek victory over the Persians and permitted Hellenic culture to flourish. The seminal cultural and intellectual contribution of the



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Greeks to world history was an objective, logical world-view as embodied in the Aristotelean syllogism. As Revilo Oliver has noted:

> The Occidental mind, which appears fully formed in the earliest Greek philosophers and has not since changed, is the mind of conceptual thought—of thought directed from the mind toward an object. The Oriental mind... does not think conceptually; its thought is never directed away from itself. The Oriental mind cannot separate what it is thinking about from itself. The capacity for objective thought is peculiar to the philosophical mind of the West... [T]he unique civilization of the West [is] a unity—a single continuity that runs, with fluctuations but no break, from the ancient Greeks to ourselves.[3]

The objective Greek world-view was expressed in the cosmological speculation of the pre-Socratic philosophers of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. Thales, who may have been the world's first astronomer, is reported to have predicted an eclipse that occurred in 585 B.C.[4] His speculation that water is the source of all things was made in such a way that has led him to be considered "the first man in history to suggest that there is an order in nature which the mind can comprehend."[5] Later, in the fifth century, by abstract reasoning, Democritus anticipated some of the basic concepts of contemporary atomic theory.

The philosophy of this era also contributed the notion of *areté,* which is sometimes translated as *virtue,* but might better be described as a career-specific drive for excellence and its fulfillment. It is from this ancient Greek ideal that the modern exhortations of: "Be the best you can be" and "Reach your highest potential" are derived. In Homeric literature the *areté* of the warrior was bravery coupled with victory. The *areté* of the philosopher was knowledge, and optimally abstract knowledge about the process of obtaining knowledge itself or "contemplation."

Greek philosophy was complemented by literature, sculpture and architecture. The comedic and tragic works of the early Greek dramatists from Euripides to Æschylus served as models for literature throughout the history of the West and the surviving amphitheaters serve as reminders of the active participation of the ancient Greek populace in their local culture.

Greek sculpture followed the general cultural dictum of Protagoras that "Man is the measure of all things." It depicted ideal human forms such as Myron's *Discus Thrower*[6] and Praxiteles' *Aphrodite* whose ethnic characteristics serve as a reminder of a more homogeneous past. The inspiring architecture of the Acropolis, and particularly the Parthenon, remains a standard for public buildings to this day. The mathematical contributions of the Greeks go beyond the Pythagorean theorem and include Euclidean geometry and the



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

application of mathematics to physics and military technology by Archimedes.

Unfortunately for the ancient Greeks, Alexander the Great, who died in 323 B.C., despite being an astute tactician, unwittingly became the first apostle of multiculturalism and demonstrated the ethnocultural dangers of empire-building. After conquering Persia, in an apparent effort to consolidate his rule, Alexander married a Persian princess, dressed as a Persian nobleman and encouraged his officers to marry Persian women. Alexander "declared that all men were alike sons of one Father and... he prayed that Macedonians and Persians might be partners in the commonwealth and that the peoples of his world might live in harmony and in unity of heart and mind."[7]

Predictably, Alexander's goal of imposing Hellenic civilization upon his newly-conquered subjects was not accomplished. Instead, many immigrants from the conquered Eastern territories made their way to Greece with the result being cultural and genetic dissonance, as well as religious syncretism and a condition of social confusion sometimes referred to as *anomie*. These Eastern immigrants contributed toward the de-Hellenization of Greece by importing their world-rejecting escapist mystery cults which began to appeal to the native Greek population due to the sociocultural stress they were experiencing. The individual anxiety and depression associated with anomie also contributed toward what has been described as a "failure of nerve" which had political and military consequences as well.

Later, in the Hellenistic era, as Greece became immersed in the cultural diversity of its Eastern subject peoples, Greek philosophy reflected the Eastern orientation toward the interior life of the mystical and supernatural. While Plato's view of a separation between a transcendent and immutable world of ideas and earthly world of corresponding inferior forms may be a reflection of Middle Eastern dualism, in his *Republic*, Plato defends the fundamental unit of Greek life, the *polis* or city-state. In his famous allegory of the cave, Plato conveys his belief that the ruling class should be drawn from those philosophers, who upon attaining knowledge, leave behind the shadowy distortions of the cave but feel compelled to return and risk their lives attempting to enlighten their countrymen who languish in ignorance.

It might be noted that the model of the Greek city-states and the medieval model of a conglomeration of local European ethnostates both correspond closely to the optimal model for human evolution by encouraging the development of a variety of competing population groups within the boundaries of Europe. Ancient efforts at empire-building and contemporary trends toward globalization thwart the operation of this fundamental life process.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Commenting on the impending end of human evolution in the *Cambridge Encyclopedia of Human Evolution*, British geneticist Steve Jones, one of the Encyclopedia's three editors, has noted that a "pattern of small, isolated and partially inbred populations has characterized humanity for most of our evolutionary history." However, "no longer will the human species be made up of a network of small and isolated populations, each evolving more or less independently. Instead future generations of humanity will behave much more like a single genetic unit." Jones concludes:

> Many geneticists believe that evolution is particularly rapid in groups of small populations that exchange occasional migrants... The rapidity of human evolution may be partly due to our tribal structure, whose genetic effects were increased by repeated bottlenecks experienced as human populations spread into new parts of the world. Increased mobility means that this phase of history is now at an end, and perhaps, that ***human evolution is now almost over***.[8] [Emphasis added.]

The decrease in reproductive isolation resulting from increased mobility may not be without dire consequences. Although an immediate effect may be a reduction in genetic diseases, Jones aloofly concedes, that apparently "this phase cannot last: sooner or later the harmful genes will again reappear in double dose, so that future generations may have to pay the price...."[9]

After the decline of Greece, Rome followed a similar pattern of initial homogeneous cultural achievement followed by empire-building and consequent alien immigration. In order to increase tax revenues, aliens were granted citizenship with its attendant tax obligations. The heterogenization of the Roman Empire contributed to social, psychological and religious destabilization resulting in the increased appeal of religious cults which offered an artificial, non-biological sense of community in this world and the hope of salvation in the next. In a study entitled, *Enemies of the Roman Order*, historian Ramsay MacMullen has remarked that by the fourth century A.D.:

> The civilization called Roman... yields to another, compounded of heterogeneous elements formerly suppressed....[B]eliefs about the supernatural, once illegal or contemptuously relegated to ploughboys and servant girls, after the first century began to infect even the educated, and were ultimately embodied as a principal element in late antique philosophy.... In the end [the fourth century A.D.].... [t]here was little "Roman" left in the Roman empire. Rather, the "un-Roman" elements had come to the fore, and now controlled the world in which they lived.[10]

As Rome grew weak, its enemies saw an opportunity to overrun the West. In 452, Attila the Hun and his Asiatic hordes proceeded



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Westward as far as Chalôns in central Gaul. Fortunately, the Roman general Aetius and the Visigothic leader Theodoric put aside their historic rivalry and united to face Atilla. Unfortunately, then as well as today, there were those of the West who allied themselves with the enemy. At the battle of Chalôns it was the Ostrogoths. Nevertheless, the combined Roman and Visigothic forces succeeded in repelling the Huns.[11]

In the beginning of the eighth century the integrity of the West was once again threatened. The Moors, led by Abd-er-Rahman had crossed the Pyrenees and fought their way north toward the city of Tours. But on October 10, 732 at the Battle of Tours their fortune changed. According to the medieval *Chronicle of St. Denis:*

> The Muslims planned to go to Tours to destroy the Church of St. Martin, the city, and the whole country. Then came against them the glorious Prince Charles, at the head of his whole force.... [H]e fought as fiercely as the hungry wolf falls upon the stag. By the grace of Our Lord, he wrought a great slaughter upon the enemies of the Christian faith, so that—as history bears witness—he slew in that battle 300,000 men, including their king by the name Abd-er-Rahman. Then was [Charles] first called "Martel," for as a hammer of iron, of steel, and of every other metal,... he dashed and smote in the battle all of his enemies. And what was the greatest marvel of all, he lost in that battle only 1500 men.[12]

Early Christianity had found fertile ground for its message of individual salvation among the alienated, heterogeneous, urban inhabitants of the declining Roman Empire. Later, in the Early Middle Ages when Christian missionaries sought to convert the Germanic and Celtic peoples, it became apparent that for Christianity to be accepted by a more cohesive, homogeneous, pastoral-warrior society, it needed to appeal to the different concerns of that society. Hence, Early Medieval Christianity appealed to matters of group survival such as victory in battle, healthy families, and abundant crops and livestock. Germanic Christianity addressed these pre-Christian folk-religious concerns through local patron saints and clergy and their holy relics. In an apparent attempt to convert the Saxons who had been persecuted by Charlemagne, an adaptation of the New Testament known as the *Heliand* was composed in Old Saxon. It portrayed Christ and his apostles as a Germanic warrior-band. Eventually a Middle Eastern salvation religion was transformed into a European folk religion and Christianity became more closely identified with Europe, especially with the emergence of the notion of "Christendom."

Early Medieval Christianity provided a spiritual impetus and a source of solidarity that are likely to have contributed toward European



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

victories over invading forces. The bond between religious and temporal spheres increased under Charles Martel's Carolingian descendants. They tended to view Christianity as the religion of a Roman Empire which they admired and sought to reconstruct. The application of religious fervor toward Western military exploits is perhaps nowhere better illustrated than in a twelfth-century treatise of St. Bernard of Clairveaux entitled, *In Praise of the New Knighthood.* Written as an exhortation to the Knights Templar and other Crusaders, it distinguishes between fighting for "empty glory" or "earthly possessions" and fighting to assert Euro-Christian dominance in the Holy Land where Euro-Christian pilgrims and shrines had been attacked.

Recalling the existing medieval nexus between European self-identity and Christendom the following words of St. Bernard may be interpreted as a religious rationalization, if not an encouragement to assertively defend Western interests. Bernard writes:

> The knights of Christ may safely fight the battles of their Lord, fearing neither sin if they smite the enemy, nor danger at their own death; since to inflict death or to die for Christ is no sin, but rather, an abundant claim to glory.... The knight of Christ, I say, may strike with confidence and die yet more confidently, for he serves Christ when he strikes, and serves himself when he falls.[13]

The religious themes of medieval art and literature appear to have been complemented by the subliminal appeal of the racial features of the subjects portrayed. Persons of European descent, regardless of their religious orientation, are likely to find representations of religious figures appealing. The many excellent Madonnas painted during this period may also indicate a racially healthy celebration of fertility.

The Renaissance artists and sculptors, including Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo and Raphael, resurrected the Classical ideal of the human form and created works of incomparable beauty. The subject matter of art and sculpture began to once again include the Classical deities, royalty, and other members of the secular elite. In the Romantic period, positive portrayals of the common folk, as well as idealized and legendary depictions of the heritages of the European nations became popular in art and literature. The literature of this period likewise drew upon the West's Classical heritage as well as European legends and history, as is evidenced by William Shakespeare's choice of subjects for his plays exemplified by *Julius Caesar, Hamlet,* and *Henry IV*.

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, southeastern Europe became the target of Muslim aggression. Turks and Tartars plundered the countryside, taking captives and holding them for ransom, or worse, selling them as slaves. In 1682, Poland and Austria



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formed an alliance against a possible large-scale Turkish invasion. In March of 1683, a Turkish army of over 140,000 soldiers started marching northward and laid siege to Vienna. As the Turks were about to break through the walls of Vienna, the Polish warrior-king, Jan Sobieski arrived with 30,000 troops. On September 12, 1683 the Battle of Vienna ensued, and according to the following contemporary account:

> The battle . . . lasted fourteen or fifteen hours; the slaughter was horrible, and the loss of the Turks inestimable, for they left upon the field of battle, besides the dead and prisoners, all their cannon, equipment, tents and infinite riches that they had been six years gathering together throughout the whole Ottoman Empire. The battle ended by the infantry in the trenches, and on the Isle of the Danube, where the Turks had an artillery battery. The night was spent in slaughter, and the unhappy remnant of the Turkish army saved their lives by flight, having abandoned all to the victors. [14]

The Age of Exploration actually began with the heroic expeditions of our Viking ancestors to Iceland, Greenland and North America, or *Vinland*, as they referred to it. The Vikings also contributed to the development of trade routes throughout Europe and to the creation of Russia. The accomplishments of Christopher Columbus have recently come under criticism by contemporary opponents of the West. In 1992, American Indian groups protested a parade in Denver to commemorate the 500th anniversary of his discovery of America, which was promptly canceled as a result. Public recognition of the contribution of Columbus' sponsor, Queen Isabella of Spain, has fared even worse. She was denied even the minimal recognition of a stamp being issued in her honor, apparently due to her expulsion of the Jews from Spain and Portugal in 1492, the same year not only of Columbus' discovery, but also of the Spanish victory over the Moors in Grenada and the subsequent Euro-Christian re-conquest of the entire Iberian Peninsula.

More recent exploratory contributions of the West include the Lewis and Clark Expedition and the exploration of the polar regions by Roald Amundsen, Richard Byrd, Robert Peary and Sir Edward Shackleton. Just before Shackleton's ship, the *Endurance* reached Antarctica in 1915, it became trapped in ice-flows and was eventually destroyed by icebergs. Shackleton and a few off his men began a search for help. After an 850-mile journey in a 20-foot craft through some of the worst weather and seas on record, Shackleton reached a small outpost of civilization from where he called for help. He then returned to the men he had stranded. Remarkably, throughout the entire ordeal, not a single man died.

Copernicus, Galileo, Newton and Kepler developed the mathematical and astronomical foundations of space exploration, which



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in this century was accelerated by the work of Robert Goddard, Werner von Braun and Arthur Rudolph. Rudolph's service to the United States space program was rewarded by essentially being hounded out of the country after the government, at the behest of a shrill minority of ingrates, threatened to revoke his pension.

The most sublime contribution of the West has been its music. The works of Handel, Bach, Mozart, Haydn, Beethoven and Brahms are revered the world over. Special respect is due to those composers who incorporated a national consciousness into their compositions, including Richard Wagner, Franz Liszt, Edvard Grieg, Antonin Dvorak, Sergei Rachmaninoff, Jan Sibelius, Giuseppe Verdi and John Philip Sousa. From *Rienzi* and the *Ring* cycle, to *Parsifal,* Wagner captured the Western ethos and developed what he termed *Gesamtkunstwerke* or "total art productions" in which he not only composed the music, but also wrote the lyrics, designed the stage sets and costumes, and eventually built his own opera house. One of the greatest tragedies of our time is the deliberate alienation of our youth from their classical musical heritage.

In the field of medicine, from Hippocrates to Galen and from William Harvey to Louis Pasteur, Marie Curie and Alexander Fleming, who discovered the powerful antibiotic effect of penicillin, and Christian Barnard, who performed the first heart transplant, Western medicine has distinguished itself without parallel. One of the effects of the accomplishments of Western medicine had been a global increase in longevity and consequent population increase in so-called "under-developed nations" at the same time that the population of European nations is contracting. Similarly, the Western advances in transportation to which Henry Ford, the Wright Brothers, and Charles Lindbergh contributed, have inadvertently, all but obliterated the West's geographic isolation. As a result we must develop a heightened awareness of alternate social isolating mechanisms, such as physical appearance, if we wish to enhance our prospects for survival.

The authors of the great epic literature of the West, from Homer and Virgil to the authors of *Beowulf*, the Norse sagas, the *Song of Roland* and the *Nibelungenlied* have provided our People with inspiration for future noble deeds. A modern epic that is now being re-enacted in Australia's recent confrontation with a boatload of refugees, is Jean Raspail's *Camp of the Saints,* which should be required reading for all persons of European descent who labor under the pseudo-morality of self-destruction. Friedrich Nietzsche also provides a critique of misdirected altruism which he describes as the "morality of decadence." In his *Twilight of the Idols,* Nietzsche wrote that:

> [A] morality in which self-interest wilts away—remains a bad



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> sign under all circumstances. This is true of individuals; it is particularly true of nations. The best is lacking when self-interest begins to be lacking. Instinctively to choose what is harmful for *oneself*, to feel attracted by "disinterested" motives, that is virtually the formula of decadence.

No discussion of morality, religion and science would be complete without acknowledging Raymond Cattell's important works, *A New Morality from Science: Beyondism* (Pergamon, 1972), and *Beyondism: Religion from Science* (Praeger, 1987) Cattell's accomplishments in personality assessment, psychometric testing, and other fields resulted in his being nominated for a life-time achievement award by the American Psychological Foundation. However, two interlopers' protestations which were graciously amplified by a *New York Times* report, succeeded in postponing the award until an investigation could be made into Cattell's personal beliefs on race. In the meantime, Cattell withdrew his name from consideration for the award and died.[15]

Most advances in communication from Gutenberg's printing press to the telegraph and television were Western contributions. From Samuel Morse, Nikola Tesla and Guglielmo Marconi to Thomas Edison, Alexander Graham Bell and Philo Farnsworth came great inventions with the potential to enlighten and fortify our People. Yet this potential was never realized. Instead these inventions were hijacked by Mayer, Thalberg, Warner, and Cohn *et al* who sought to utilize our media for their financial gain, or worse, to manipulate our opinions and behavior.

Philo Farnsworth was a fourteen year-old Mormon farm boy in Idaho when he first conceived the design of the television. He later not only invented the cathode-ray tubes used for the first television, but also the first simple electron microscope. During the 1960s he worked on a nuclear fusion process to produce clean energy. At the time of his death in 1971 he held more than 300 U.S. and foreign patents, but to this day Farnsworth's contributions are virtually unknown.

When Radio Corporation of America's president, David Sarnoff, learned of Farnsworth's independent progress, he sent a spy to observe Farnsworth's research so that RCA could register patents for the new invention before Farnsworth. Even though after a protracted legal battle, Farnsworth won the patent rights, television production was halted during the war years, and by the war's end the patents began to expire. Depressed, Farnsworth retired to Maine where he began to drink heavily, suffered a nervous breakdown and received shock therapy. Finally, his home burned to the ground. Meanwhile Sarnoff basked in glory, promoting himself and the spy he had sent to steal Farnsworth's research, as the "father of television."

Before his death in 1971, Farnsworth noted with dismay the



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

direction which television had taken. His son Kent recalls that his father "felt he had created kind of a monster, a way for people to waste a lot of their lives." The elder Farnsworth's advice to his son regarding television was: "There's nothing on it worthwhile, and we're not going to watch it in this household, and I don't want it in your intellectual diet."[16]

Two other virtually unknown Western inventors whose contributions have shaped the modern world were Jack Kilby and Robert Noyce who developed the microchip. They found a way to mass-produce entire networks of miniature electronic components on a single crystal or "chip." Kilby used chips made of germanium and while Noyce used chips made of silicon, hence the name for that area of California farmland that has become known as "Silicon Valley." Kilby, a former associate of William Shockley, founded Fairchild Semiconductor Corporation in 1957, while Noyce founded INTEL in 1968. Robert Noyce died in 1990, while Jack Kilby was finally awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics last year for "basic work on information and communication technology."

Ten years ago, a new communications medium was introduced in the West. From 1991 to 1995 the number of World Wide Web users jumped from 600,000 to 40 million. Today it stands at over 500 million. The man responsible for creating the World Wide Web from the pre-existing less user-friendly basic Internet structure was Tim Berners-Lee. He created the Hyper-Text Mark-up Language, which is used to post text and graphics to a website, and the protocol language used to communicate between users and websites, as well as a web-browser prototype. Unlike so many others who hopped on the dot-com bandwagon to make a quick fortune, Berners-Lee has been content to work quietly behind the scenes from M.I.T. directing a non-profit consortium that seeks to maintain Internet software compatibility and hence ensure open access to the World Wide Web. Let us be ever vigilant against those who seek to restrict freedom of expression via this new and vital medium.

During the first half of the twentieth century, some Western poets exhibited a concern for the preservation of our cultural and genetic heritage. Ezra Pound was tortured by U.S. troops for his radio broadcasts advocating peace during the West's fratricidal Second World War. Pound was a mentor of T. S. Eliot, and helped Eliot edit *The Wasteland*, a critique of Western decadence. Eliot described some conditions for an optimal society:

> The population should be homogeneous.... What is still more important is unity of religious background; and reasons of race and culture combine to make any large number of free-thinking



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> Jews undesirable. There must be a proper balance between urban and rural, industrial and agricultural development. And a spirit of excessive tolerance is to be deprecated.[17]

A major contribution of the West has been its concern for the protection of the global environment. In 1847, George Marsh, a Vermont Congressman became the first public advocate of environmental conservation when he called attention to the destructive impact of deforestation and proposed a land management plan. In 1864, Marsh published an influential analysis of conservation issues entitled *Man and Nature.* The naturalist writings of Henry David Thoreau also contributed toward the public awareness of conservation issues in America. Rachel Carson initiated the modern environmental movement with the publication of *Silent Spring* in 1964. She astutely observed that "Man is a part of nature, and his war against nature is inevitably a war against himself."[18]

Garrett Hardin has applied environmental ideals to the problem of human over-population in his 1993 book *Living Within Limits.* Even more perceptive is his 1999 book entitled *The Ostrich Factor: Our Population Myopia.* The recent works of the "father of sociobiology," E. O. Wilson, on *Biodiversity* and *Consilience* are also important in this regard. In *Concilience*, Wilson warns us:

> *Homo sapiens*, the first truly free species, is about to decommission natural selection, the force that made us.... Soon we must look deep within ourselves and decide what we wish to become.[19]

Perhaps the greatest contributions of the West to world history have been Charles Darwin's theory of evolution and Gregor Mendel's discovery of the fundamental laws of genetics as well as their eugenic application. Francis Galton, Darwin's cousin made such important eugenic observations in his founding work, *Hereditary Genius,* that Darwin himself included references to them in his *Descent of Man.* The pioneers of the eugenics movement included Harvard geneticist Charles Davenport, who founded the Carnegie Institute's genetics and evolution laboratories at Cold Spring Harbor on Long Island. Davenport convinced the widow of railroad magnate Edward Henry Harriman to endow a Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor. Harry Laughlin was the Superintendent of the Eugenics Record Office at the Carnegie Institute from its inception in 1910 until 1921 and its Director from 1921 until 1940.

One of the earliest American adherents of eugenics was Henry Fairfield Osborn, the president from 1908 to 1933 of the American Museum of Natural History and a respected paleontologist and geologist who taught at both Princeton and Columbia Universities. He



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is credited with significantly expanding the staffing and funding of the scientific department at the Museum. In 1921, Osborn hosted the Second International Congress of Eugenics at the Museum. By that time, eugenics had become a worldwide phenomenon and the exhibition reflected that, with exhibits from twenty-two states and the District of Columbia and 16 foreign countries, including Australia, China, Cuba, India, Norway, and Peru. The Conference was attended by future President Herbert Hoover and Charles Darwin's son, Leonard, who was the Chairman of the International Eugenics Commission. In 1932, the Third International Eugenics Congress was also held in New York at the American Museum of Natural History. Mrs. Harriman was among the sponsors, as was Mrs. DuPont and Dr. John Harvey Kellogg, the homeopathic physician and cereal company executive, who also founded the Race Betterment Foundation.

In 1953, James Watson and Francis Crick discovered the structure of DNA. Commenting on the Human Genome Program, Watson has stated: "We used to think our fate was in the stars. Now we know, in large measure, our fate is in our genes."[20] William Shockley not only received the Nobel Prize for his contribution to the development of the transistor, but also led a one-man crusade against dysgenic American policies. Despite threats on his life, Arthur Jensen persevered in studying the relationship between IQ and race. In Canada, neither state-sponsored censorship nor private harassment has deterred J. Philippe Rushton's inquiries into *Race, Evolution and Behavior.* The importance of applying eugenic measures in the West becomes evident from Richard Lynn's recent work on *Dysgenics* and his just-released seminal work *Eugenics: A Reassessment.*

Sociobiology has been applied to religion by Walter Burkert in his interdisciplinary study entitled *Creation of the Sacred: Tracks of Biology in Early Religion* (Harvard, 1996). In an earlier work, Burkert wrote "Religious ritual is advantageous in the process of selection, if not for the individual, then at least for the continuance of group identity."[21] Burkert's view is echoed in the following paragraph from the *Seattle Times* summary of the paper, "The Neural Basis of Religious Experience" by V. S. Ramachandran, *et al,* at the University of California, San Diego:

> "It is not clear why such dedicated neural machinery . . . for religion may have evolved," the team reported yesterday at a meeting of the Society for Neuroscience in New Orleans. One possibility, the scientists said, was to encourage tribe loyalty or reinforce kinship ties or the stability of a closely knit clan.[22]

While Judaism has functioned to sustain the Jewish People,



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

contemporary Western Christianity has, on the contrary, deliberately dissociated itself from its European ethnocultural heritage, and has focused on "universal social justice." There is now afoot a conscious effort to de-Europeanize and to re-Judaize Christianity, through scriptural revision, internal treachery and external pressure. One possible strategy to counter these efforts is to encourage a re-Europeanization of Christianity into a European folk religion. Such a strategy might be bolstered by the argument that Euro-Christians should only accept the folk-affirming form of Christianity accepted by our ancestors and not accept the specious "bait and switch" arguments of liberal Christians who try to indoctrinate us with universalist propaganda. Thought-provoking discussions of past, present, and future religious and ethnocultural encounters may be found in Samuel Huntington's timely *Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (Simon & Schuster, 1996), and Matthew Connelly and Paul Kennedy's December 1994 *Atlantic Monthly* article "Must it be the Rest Against the West?" The study of the rise and fall of civilizations has captivated many Western minds, from the racial speculations of Arthur de Gobineau, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, and Madison Grant to the organic model of Oswald Spengler and the challenge-response model of Arnold Toynbee. More recent works on this perplexing subject have been written by Francis Parker Yockey, Carroll Quigley, Lawrence Brown, James Burnham, William Gayley Simpson, and Elmer Pendell, who, in his excellent inquiry into *Why Civilizations Self-Destruct* observed that:

> In our own civilization we see a lessening of the struggle for survival. Welfare does away with natural selection. Nothing in our present environment can serve as an adequate substitute for the harsh means evolution adopted to prevent the weaker elements of civilizations from playing a major part in the formation of subsequent generations. Compassion, unfortunately, is the enemy of biological progress.[23]

Pendell therefore proposed a marriage law that would limit the number of children permitted in a family based upon the intelligence of the parents.

Due to the relaxation of selective pressures as a civilization matures, in most instances the genetic quality of the founders of a civilization is greater than the quality of those who inhabit it during its decline. One may be led to wonder that since the net result of a few hundred years of civilization, without some form of eugenic mechanism, is usually the undoing of millennia of genetic evolution, whether it might be better for a formal civilization never to emerge, hence preserving and perhaps increasing the genetic quality of a more rural, more independent population, within which selective pressures could operate more freely.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In addition to his work on I.Q., Rushton's Genetic Similarity Theory provides a biological basis for understanding the enduring preference of genetically similar individuals for each other. It also provides insights for resolving many of the ethnic conflicts which exist in the world today.[24] Kevin MacDonald's work on religion, and particularly Judaism, as a group evolutionary strategy, is essential for a thorough understanding of our current predicament.[25]

While liberals and universalists constantly yammer about "bringing us all together", and how "diversity is our strength," it may be suggested that the biological function of human language and culture is just the opposite, that is, to keep discrete groups apart. In my own view, culture in humans is analogous to instinct in other species. Species with more complex brains tend to rely less on instinct and more on learned behavior, which in humans, includes culture. For culture in human societies to accomplish that which instinct accomplishes in non-human societies, it must establish a sense of group identity so that the individual knows whom to act altruistically toward and whom to mate with. In short, among humans, culture functions sociobiologically as an isolating mechanism.

The organized anti-Western media of today seem to scour the gutters of the ghetto for the most vile filth imaginable and then serve it up to our children as "their culture." Perhaps Konrad Lorenz's animal behavior research might provide us with some clues as to how MTV has succeeded in contriving the acceptance, if not preference of white adolescents for "rap music" and its attendant so-called "hip-hop culture" of fashion and language. Lorenz gained some popularity for his theories of imprinting when he acted as a substitute for a mother goose soon after her eggs had hatched. Since goslings imprint upon the first moving object they see after they are born as if it were their mother, the little goslings began following Lorenz.

The time during which imprinting occurs is called the "critical period" or "sensitive period."[26] This initial form of imprinting shortly after birth is known as "filial imprinting." Among humans, it is believed that there is a period of linguistic imprinting during which a baby imprints upon a particular language. There is another form of imprinting that is believed to take place during sexual maturation. This "sexual imprinting" is a process by which animals identify what traits suitable mates should possess.[27] Females are usually more deeply influenced by sexual imprinting. Animals tend to imprint upon the traits of their parents and siblings, since they have the most social contact with them.

It has been demonstrated that finches raised by foster parents of a different species of finch will later exhibit a lifelong sexual attraction toward the alien species. One wonders how a child's sexual imprinting



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mechanism is affected by forcible racial integration and near continual exposure to media stimuli promoting interracial contact.

The most serious implication of human sexual imprinting for our genetic future is that it would establish the destructiveness of school integration, especially in the middle and high-school years. One can only wonder to what degree the advocates of school integration, such as former NAACP attorney Jack Greenberg, were conscious of this scientific concept. It also compounds the culpability of media moguls who deliberately popularize miscegenation in films directed toward adolescents and pre-adolescents. In the midst of this onslaught against our youth, parents need to be reminded that they have a natural obligation, as essential as providing food and shelter, to instill in their children an acceptance of appropriate ethnic boundaries for socialization and for marriage.

The sociobiological warfare that our youth is subjected to is likely to be even more diabolical since it appears to deliberately exploit a biological theory of sexual imprinting at the critical period of sexual maturity. Movies like this past year's spate of miscegenationist titles, *Save the Last Dance, Crazy / Beautiful* and *O*, a parody of Othello, appear deliberately designed to exploit the critical period of sexual imprinting in their target audiences of white pre-adolescent girls and adolescent young women.

The current of misdirected altruism that permeates contemporary Western society is dangerous when it is divorced from biological reality. It would be better to ignorantly adhere to the laws of human evolution, as do most primitive peoples, than to understand these laws and yet deliberately disobey them. It would be most tragic if the people who discovered the theory of evolution were to perish due to a failure of will to apply it to their own destiny.

It is our duty to maintain and advance the Western continuum that originated in ancient Greece and earlier. To falter at this critical juncture is to allow our people to approach extinction. The greatest achievement of the West will be our extrication from our current dilemma. If we succeed in our efforts, the chroniclers of this age will celebrate our valiant struggle in the epic literature of the future – if we fail, there will be no such literature and our beleaguered descendants will mock us in our graves.

---

*James C. Russell, Ph.D., is the author of* ***The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity: A Sociohistorical Approach to Religious Transformation*** *(Oxford University Press, 1994)*

---



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## ENDNOTES

1. Rex Warner ii. trans. *Thucydides: the Peloponnesian War* 4, (London: Bodley Head, 1954), p. 116.

2. Robert S. Lopez, *The Birth of Europe* (New York: M. Evans and Co., 1967), pp. 120-21.

3. Revilo P. Oliver, *America's Decline: The Education of a Conservative* (London: Londinium Press, 1987), pp. 216-17.

4. *Greek Philosophy: Thales to Aristotle* Reginald E. Allen, ed. & intro. (New York: Free Press, 1967), p. 1.

5. Ibid., p. 2.

6. Detailed photographs of this marvelous work are available at: http://www.phil.uni-erlangen.de/~p1altar/photo_html/plastik/maennlich/bewegt/diskobol/diskobol.html.

7. W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* (1948; reprint, Boston: Beacon Press, 1956), p. 147.

8. Steve Jones, et al, *Cambridge Encyclopedia of Human Evolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

9. Ibid.

10. Ramsay MacMulllen, *Enemies of the Roman Order* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1981), pp. viii-ix.

11. The Gothic historian Jordanes describes the battle in Chapter 38 of his *History of the Goths*, which is translated in William Stearns Davis, ed., *Readings in Ancient History: Illustrative Extracts from the Sources*, 2 Vols. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1912-13), Vol. II: *Rome and the West*, pp. 322-25.

12. William Stearns Davis, ed., *Readings in Ancient History: Illustrative Extracts from the Sources*, 2 vols. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1912-13), vol. II: *Rome and the West*, pp. 362-364.

13. Bernard of Clairveaux, *Liber ad milites Templi: De laude novae militae*, trans. Conrad Greenia in *The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux*, Vol. 7, Cistercian Fathers Series: 19, (Cistercian Publications, Kalamazoo, Mich., 1977).

14. *The Secret History of the Reign of John Sobieski*, The III of that Name, King of Poland, containing a particular account of the siege of Vienna. . . . trans. François-Paulin Dalairac (London: Rhodes, Bennet, Bell, Leigh & Midwinter, 1700), pp. 355-364.

15. An excellent detailed account of this outrage may be found in Glayde Whitney, "Raymond B. Cattell and The Fourth Inquisition" *Mankind Quarterly* , vol. 38, no. 1 & 2, Fall/Winter 1997, pp. 99-124.

16. Neil Postman, "Philo Farnsworth" in *Time: 100 Scientists* http://www.time.com/time/time100/scientist/profile/farnsworth.html.

17. T. S. Eliot, *After Strange Gods: A Primer in Modern Heresy* (London: Faber, 1934), p. 20.

18. Rachel Carson, in a CBS television interview in 1963: http://www.sover.net/~mjez/newspapercolumns/rachelcarson.htm

19. E. O. Wilson, *Consilience: The Unity of Knowledge* (New York: Knopf, 1998), *p. ?*.

20. James D. Watson, quoted by Leon Jaroff in *Time* 20 March 1989.

21. Walter Burkert, *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

22. *Seattle Times*, Oct. 29, 1997.

23. Elmer Pendell, *Why Civilizations Self-Destruct* (Cape Canaveral, Florida: Howard Allen), p. 126.

24. J. Philippe Rushton, "Genetic Similarity Theory and the Roots of Ethnic Conflict" *Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies* 23:4 (Winter 1998): 477-86.

25. Kevin MacDonald, *A People that Shall Dwell Alone: Judaism as a Group Evolutionary Strategy* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1994); *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism* (1998); *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements* (1998).

26. John Archer, *Ethology and Human Development* (Hemel Hempstead, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992).

27. Todd, P.M., and Miller, G.F. "Parental guidance suggested: How parental imprinting evolves through sexual selection as an adaptive learning mechanism" *Adaptive Behavior*, 2(1), 5-47. See also David T Lykken and Auke Tellegen, "Is Human Mating Adventitious or the Result of Lawful Choice? A Twin Study of Mate Selection" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1993: vol. 65. no. I, 56-68.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Enemies of My Enemy

## The 'Jewish Threat':
### Anti-Semitic Politics of the U.S. Army

Joseph W. Bendersky
New York: Basic Books, 2000
$30 US

xvii + 539 pp.

*Reviewed by Kevin MacDonald*

Since the latter decades of the 19th century there has been a remarkable increase in the cultural and political power of Jewish groups and an equally remarkable decline in the cultural and political power of Northern European peoples. In 1880 the vast majority of the Jewish population lived in Eastern Europe well removed from the centers of Northern European power. These Jewish populations had expanded dramatically during the 19th century—more rapidly than any other European group. This rapid expansion placed enormous strains on both the Jewish and non-Jewish populations of Eastern Europe. As they have in so many traditional societies, Jews had achieved a dominant position in the economies of Eastern Europe.

But there was also a large mass of impoverished Jews who were strongly attracted to messianic religious and political ideologies, especially Zionism and leftist political radicalism. Because of Jewish economic and cultural domination and lack of assimilation, there was also an upsurge in popular and governmental anti-Semitism throughout the area, most famously with the pogroms in Russia beginning in 1881, but extending throughout Eastern and Central Europe. The result was an effort by Jewish organizations to remove Jews from Eastern Europe to other countries, most notably the United States. Between 1880 and 1924, approximately 2 million Jews immigrated to the United States from Eastern Europe. This event was of momentous importance for the history of the United States in the 20th century and beyond.

Joseph Bendersky's book is a history of the conflict between an increasingly powerful Jewish group and a declining Northern European



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

group as revealed in the writings of U.S. Army officers gleaned from the files of the Military Intelligence Division (MID) of the War Department. As recounted by Bendersky, Americans of Northern European descent in the United States thought of themselves as part of a cultural and ethnic heritage extending backward in time to the founding of the country. The Anglo-Saxon heritage of the British Isles was at the center of this self-conception, but Americans of German and Scandinavian descent also viewed themselves as part of this ethnic and cultural inheritance. They had a great deal of pride in their accomplishments. They believed that their civilization was a product of their own unique ingenuity and skills, and they believed that it would not survive if other peoples were allowed to play too large a role in it.

Christianity was a deeply embedded aspect of the culture of the Northern Europeans, but it played a remarkably small role in the battles with the emerging Jewish elite. Far more important for framing these battles were Darwinian theories of race. The early part of the 20th century was the high water mark of Darwinism in the social sciences. It was common at that time to think that there were important differences between the races—that races differed in intelligence and in moral qualities. Not only did races differ, but they were in competition with each other for supremacy. Schooled in the theories of Madison Grant, Lothrop Stoddard, Henry Pratt Fairchild, William Ripley, Gustav Le Bon, Charles Davenport, and William McDougall, this generation of U.S. military officers viewed themselves as members of a particular race and believed that racial homogeneity was the *sine qua non* of every stable nation state. They regarded their racial group as uniquely talented and possessed of a high moral sense.

But, more importantly, whatever the talents and vulnerabilities of their race, they held it in the highest importance to retain control over the lands they had inherited as a result of the exploits of their ancestors who had conquered the continent and tamed the wilderness. And despite the power that their race held at the present, there was dark foreboding about the future, reflected in the titles of some of the classic works of the period: Grant's *The Passing of the Great Race* and Stoddard's *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World Supremacy* and *The Revolt Against Civilization: The Menace of the Under-Man*.

This world of Northern European cultural pride and self-confident hegemony has vanished, and there can be little doubt that the rise of the Jews and the decline of Northern Europeans are causally linked. Bendersky's book is as much a marker of that transformation as it is an extraordinary record of an important arena in the conflict between Jews and Northern Europeans. Bendersky's sense of intellectual and moral superiority and his contempt for his Northern European subjects ooze



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from every page. The book is a triumphalist history written by a member of a group that won the intellectual and political wars of the 20th century.

The main thrusts of Jewish activism against Northern European hegemony focused on several critical power centers in the United States: The academic world of information in the social sciences and humanities, the political and legal world where public policy on immigration and other ethnic issues is decided, and the mass media where "ways of seeing" are presented to the public (MacDonald, 1998/2001). As recounted in *The "Jewish Threat,"* all of these power centers were important in the battle against the generation of U.S. army officers who came to power after World War I. In focusing on these power centers, these Jewish efforts essentially sidestepped the U.S. military. Their effort was aimed not at achieving an influential position within the officer corps but rather at nullifying the ability of the officer corps to influence public policy. As the old guard retired or died off, it was replaced by a new generation of officers who eventually, as the century wore on, became increasingly steeped in the ideology of the new elite.

One of the advantages of being on the winning side in these intellectual and political battles is that Bendersky can safely assume that any statement by a U.S. military officer that reflects negatively on Jews or Judaism is a reflection of the prejudices and bigotry of the officer and has nothing to do with the actual behavior of Jews or the nature of Judaism. Further, any statement reflecting the Darwinian theories of race differences so prevalent in the early 20th century can safely be discounted as well because such theories have been shown to be "erroneous" (p. 262). The basic style of the book is simply to catalog the attitudes of U.S. Army officers. To the extent that the attitudes of the officers require any rebuttal at all, Bendersky deems it sufficient simply to cite statements of Jewish activist organizations and his belief that science has placed his ethnic agenda firmly on the side of the angels. In the following discussion, I will try to show that the officers had a basically accurate view of Jews and Judaism. And they were quite correct in their fear that Jewish influence would have a disastrous effect on the ability of their race to retain control of the United States.

## Beliefs about Jews and Judaism

***Jews and Bolshevism***: *The "Jewish Threat"* shows that the commonly held belief in a strong association between Jews and Bolshevism was based on a very wide range of official and unofficial sources spanning a great many countries over the entire period from World War I into the Cold War period after World War II. This information thus buttresses scholarly accounts from other sources of the



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

predominant role of Jews in leftist radicalism (see MacDonald, 1998/2001). While prone to exaggerations at times -- as expected on the basis of psychological theory -- the attitudes of U.S. Army officers were basically sound.

Nevertheless, Bendersky ascribes any special attention given to Jews as revealing "the conservative, racial, and nativist perspective of the officers" (p. 51). For example, an agent in Paris reported in 1919 that among Jews there was "a remarkable unanimity of opinion in favor of the Russian Bolshevist movement." Jews were "dazzled by the sudden access to power of their race" (p. 48). Such reports—and there were many like them—should be taken at face value that Jewish policy, in which numerous mainstream Jewish activist organizations were engaged from at least 1880—was to topple the Czar. Jewish celebration over the success of the revolution is not in the least surprising, if only because the revolution ended czarist anti-Jewish policies, and it is well attested by other sources, including some cited by Bendersky (e.g., Szajkowski 1974). For example, in 1907 Lucien Wolf, a leader of the Jewish community in England, wrote to Louis Marshall of the American Jewish Committee that "the only thing to be done on the whole Russo-Jewish question is to carry on persistent and implacable war against the Russian Government" (in Szajkowski 1967, 8). "Western Jewish leaders actively participated in general actions in favor of the liberal and revolutionary movements in Russia both during the revolution and after its downfall" (Szajowski 1967, 9).

In the same way, when Bendersky (pp. 109, 114) reports that MID agents in Riga and Berlin commented that the Soviet embassies were staffed primarily by Jews, I am inclined to believe the agents, not Bendersky's assumption that all of the masses of similar data are the paranoid ravings of racist military officers. Such a finding fits well with the general finding that Jews were massively over-represented in the early Bolshevik governments.

Bendersky also makes it appear that MID reports of Bolshevik atrocities are fantasies. Reports stated that Bolshevik methods included not only seizure and destruction of property but also "barbarism and butchery" (p. xii). Included in the intelligence reports were photographs of "naked bodies with butchered flesh, hanging upside down from trees, while 'the Bolsheviki soldiers were laughing and grinning and standing about'" (p. xiii). Bendersky writes as if such claims are unworthy of being rebutted, yet there is more than enough evidence that such things did happen. Indeed, the recently published *Black Book of Communism* not only documents the horrific slaughter of some 20 million Soviet citizens, the widespread torture, mass deportations, and imprisonment in appalling conditions, but reproduces the photos from



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1919 of a naked Polish officer impaled through the anus hanging upside down from trees while Bolshevik soldiers are laughing and grinning and standing about (Courtois et al. 1999, 202-203).

Bendersky acknowledges that large numbers of immigrant Jews flocked to leftist movements but faults the MID for not making subtle distinctions among leftists. However, his own findings show that MID placed considerable importance on the fact that American socialist groups, including the Socialist Party, "expressed jubilant support" for Bolshevik Russia (p. 123). Bendersky acknowledges that the great majority of radical leftists were immigrants but states, without support, that the concentration of the MID on Jewish neighborhoods was unwarranted (p. 124). However, MID based their estimates on the numbers of radical meetings in particular ethnic neighborhoods and on their observations at these meetings. The findings of the MID fit well with the general finding that Jews were the only immigrant group that developed an important and influential radical sub-culture, that in fact the immigrant Jewish community in the U.S. from 1886 to 1920 can best be described as "one big radical debating society" (Cohn 1958, 621; see also MacDonald 1998 / 2001).

The idea that the Bolshevik Revolution was part of a coordinated conspiracy is more problematic, but it rested on the widespread intelligence reports that wealthy Jews were important financiers of revolutionary movements—a belief that Bendersky assumes is complete fantasy but for which there is good evidence. In fact, American Jewish capitalists like Jacob Schiff did finance Russian radical movements directed at overthrowing the Czar and may well have had considerable impact (Goldstein 1990, 26-27; Szajkowski 1967). Schiff, who had already distinguished himself by leading efforts to abrogate a trade agreement between the U.S. and Russia and had financed the Japanese war effort against Russia in 1905, was repeatedly identified in MID reports as behind the international collusion among wealthy Jews and Jewish revolutionaries. Even then, officers were often remarkably judicious in their appraisal of claims by informants and agents that there was an international Jewish conspiracy, as in the case of a senior officer who responded to such claims by noting, "I am rather in doubt as to whether the conclusions drawn by this agent are based on observations sufficiently wide to be valuable. However, I am myself convinced that the subject would bear closer investigation and while I am not ready to subscribe entirely to these conclusions, still I am convinced that there may be more than a modicum of truth in them" (p. 49).

Officers were also skeptical about the notorious forgery, *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, but were nonetheless intrigued by it, not because of evidence of its authenticity but because the *Protocols* seemed to describe



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

actual Jewish behavior. For example, an officer who doubted the authenticity of the *Protocols* stated that "it is a fact that the present activities of Lenin, Trotsky and other Bolsheviks in Russia so correspond to the system as outlined herewith as to lead one to believe that this is actually the basic plan upon which the Bolshevik control functions" (pp. 64-65). Nevertheless, there were examples among the officers of "going too far" in suppositions of Jewish collusion, including fantastic tales of international intrigue among Zionist organizations, Lenin, Jewish media figures in the U.S., Jewish infiltrators of the British Secret Service, etc. (p. 136). This "going too far" in finding conspiratorial links among different Jews is a fairly common theme of anti-Semitism (see MacDonald 1998, ch. 1) but in no way invalidates the strong factual basis of Jewish involvement in Bolshevism and radical leftism generally.

***Anti-Semitism:*** Bendersky touches on all of the themes of anti-Semitism characteristic of the 20th century. Among the most prominent is that Jews are interested only in what's good for Jews and are only loyal to the countries they reside in to the extent that Jewish interests coincide with national policy (p. 37-38). In fact there is a great deal of evidence that Jews have often been disloyal to the people among whom they have lived, beginning in the ancient world right up to the current fashionableness of dual loyalty of American Jews to Israel. For example, during World War I, the MID had information that Russian Jews favored the Germans (p. 53)—hardly a surprise given their hatred for the Czar. Indeed, Russian beliefs that Jewish subjects favored Germany in the war effort resulted in eviction of Jews from the zone of combat (Pipes 1990, 231).

Bendersky repeatedly implies that MID should not have had U.S. interests at heart but Jewish interests. For example, after the Bolshevik revolution, the U.S. saw Poland as a bulwark against Soviet expansion. But from the Jewish point of view, the Polish government was anti-Jewish, and American Jewish leaders opposed recognizing or giving assistance to the Polish regime until it guaranteed minority rights. The MID was informed that Polish Jews were sympathetic to the Bolsheviks, and this new issue was mixed in with traditional Polish-Jewish animosity related to Jewish separatism, clannishness, economic domination, and disloyalty—all of which have a firm foundation in reality (see MacDonald 1998, ch. 2). When the Soviet army was expelled from Vilna in 1919, the Poles attacked Jews who were accused of collaborating with the Soviets and shooting at Polish soldiers. Jewish organizations rallied to the defense of Polish Jews, while the U.S. tilted toward Poland. The MID had reports, often from multiple sources, that Jews welcomed Soviet troops with flowers or bands, that Jews refused to fight in Polish armies, that Jewish Bolshevik leaders engaged in



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"unspeakable barbarity," that foreign Jews had stirred up anti-Polish propaganda in Jewish-controlled newspapers by exaggerating the extent of violence against Jews, etc. In fact, these allegations were substantially true. Polish Jews did welcome the 1919 and 1939 Soviet invasions of Poland, because of perceptions of Polish anti-Semitism combined with favorable opinions about the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union—that in fact Jews were an elite group in the USSR (Checinski 1982; Schatz 1991).

***Attitude of MID Officers toward Jews:*** Bendersky tries to portray the officers as thinking of Jews as a lower race, but his own data belie him. The officers thought Jews were very good in business and disinclined to manual labor (p. 37). Jews were typically seen as very intelligent. In the words of one officer, persecutions over millennia in conjunction with the "desperate, pitiless struggle for existence in occupations requiring sharpened mental qualities... [have] made the Jews the keenest race of mankind and the best equipped for a successful struggle for a 'spot in the sun' in our days of liberal laws and equal opportunity for all" (p. 44). Intellectuals who lectured at the Army War College had similar views. For example, Lothrop Stoddard viewed "The Jewish mind [as] instinctively analytical, and sharpened by the dialectic subtleties of the Talmud." Despite such statements, Bendersky, echoing the rhetoric of Jewish activist organizations throughout the period, characterizes the 1924 immigration law as directed at "inferior racial types from Southern and Eastern Europe" (p. 154).

Bendersky dismisses the officers' beliefs as resulting from "xenophobic geopolitics, anticommunism, and racial theories" (p. xiii), oftentimes using language that makes the officers seem bizarre and paranoid: "insidious [Jewish] political machinations" (p. 117), "diabolical IWW-Bolshevik scheme" (p. 126), U.S. Army officers are described as "racial sentinels" (p. 205); "officers relentlessly pursued these surreptitious forces" (p. 129); "paranoid intelligence" (p. 130); "obsession with radicalism and alien forces" (p. 133); "dire predictions" of the consequences of unrestricted immigration (p. 162); the army's understanding of "the calamitous price of the nation's neglecting the 'racial factor' in history" (p. 167); by enacting the 1924 immigration law, "America had narrowly escaped this disastrous fate [of race mixing]" (p. 181).

Officer Kenyon A. Joyce "described his work as a necessary vigilant struggle against 'subversive' Russian Communism" (p. 201). One wonders why the only word directly quoted from Joyce is "subversive", as if his attitude was weird. The activities of Communists in the U.S. were indeed subversive, and they were indeed orchestrated from Moscow. It is unconscionable that the attitudes of the officers are ascribed simply to racist paranoia given the findings of Klehr et al. 1995



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

showing that indeed the CPUSA was directed by the Soviet Union and had a high percentage of Jewish members, often above 40 percent. And citing percentages of Jews fails to take account of the personal characteristics of Jewish radicals as a talented, educated and ambitious group. Leftist sympathies were widespread in the American Jewish Congress—by far the largest organization of American Jews during this period—and Communist-oriented groups were affiliated with the Congress until being reluctantly purged during the McCarthy era (Svonkin 1997, 132, 166).

Bendersky is thus one of a long line of U.S. intellectuals who minimize the threat posed by the CPUSA, minimize Jewish involvement in the CPUSA, and present a nostalgic and exculpatory attitude toward the Jewish Old Left generally. In this version there is never any mention of the 20,000,000 Soviet citizens killed by the actions of their own government, no mention of the very large percentages of Jews who sympathized with the Soviet Union at least until after World War II, no mention of the intellectuals and media figures who downplayed these atrocities or covered them up completely. Nor is there any acknowledgement of the reality of Soviet subversion of the U.S., if for no other reason than that it successfully altered the military balance after World War II.

Bendersky in several places accepts the accounts of Jewish activist organizations' attempts to refute charges against Jews. Two common moves were to argue that Jewish radicals were apostates to Judaism and that most Jews were not radicals. Bendersky makes no attempt to unravel the subtleties of strong Jewish identification, albeit non-religious, among the vast majority of Jewish radicals (MacDonald 1998 / 2001). Nor is there any acknowledgement that even though most Jews may not have been radical in the period from 1920-1950, most radicals were Jews (MacDonald 1998 / 2001; Novick 1999). Nevertheless, it is at least doubtful that most Jews were not sympathetic to radicalism. As noted, leftist sympathies were widespread in the American Jewish Congress until the 1950s. MID also noted the well-known associations between leftist radicalism and Zionism and that prominent Jews (Louis Marshall, Louis Brandeis, Felix Frankfurter) supported Zionism. However, Bendersky does not acknowledge the well-known connection between Zionism and political radicalism among Jews during this period, presumably because it attests to the intense Jewish identification of the great majority of Jewish leftists.

***The threat represented by Jews***: Many officers "feared that 'true Americans' were losing control of something they rightfully possessed by conquest, merit, heritage and even divine providence" (p. 1). There was a tendency to see the decline of their own ethnic group as



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tantamount to the decline of civilization itself. Were they justified in these attitudes? The view that conquerors control the territory they conquer is hardly a novel idea, since this is exactly what has happened from time immemorial—as applicable to the invading Germanic tribes that overwhelmed the Western Roman Empire at the end of antiquity as to the establishment of Israel in modern times. One might argue that the view that civilization itself depended on Northern Europeans is not credible in light of what we now know about the ability of other human groups to develop advanced technology, art and literature. However, it was certainly understandable that such an inference would be made early in the 20th century when Northern European colonial powers had divided up the rest of world among themselves, when all of the scientific and technical advances had been made by Northern Europeans, and when there were huge differences in the economic and technical development not only between Europe and the rest of the world but also between Northern and Southern Europe and between Eastern and Western Europe. Such assertions also conform to the normal tendency among humans to glorify their own group and denigrate outsiders. And, writing in 2001 when Europeans are slated to be a minority in the United States within 50 years and when millions of non-Europeans are living as minorities in European countries, it certainly seems prescient that the officers' fears of "losing control" have indeed come to fruition.

Part of this sense of losing control came from changes in the media. It is remarkable that people like Lothrop Stoddard and Charles Lindbergh wrote numerous articles for the popular media, including *Collier's*, the *Saturday Evening Post* and *Reader's Digest* between World War I and World War II (p. 23). In 1920-1921, the *Saturday Evening Post* ran a series of 19 articles on Eastern European immigration emphasizing Jewish unassimilability and the Jewish association with Bolshevism. At the time, the *Post* was the most widely read magazine in the U.S., with a weekly readership of 2,000,000.

The tide against the world view of the officers turned with the election of Roosevelt." Jews served prominently in his administration," (p. 244) including Felix Frankfurter who had long been under scrutiny by MID as a "dangerous Jewish radical" (p. 244). Jews had also won the intellectual debate: "Nazi racial ideology was under attack in the press as pseudo-science and fanatical bigotry." (p. 244) Jews also had a powerful position in the media, including ownership of several large, influential newspapers (*New York Times*, *New York Post*, *Washington Post*, *Philadelphia Inquirer*, *Philadelphia Record* and *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*), radio networks (CBS, the dominant radio network, and NBC, headed by David Sarnoff), and all of the major Hollywood movie studios (see MacDonald 1998 / 2001).



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is remarkable that the word 'Nordic' disappeared by the 1930s although the restrictionists still had racialist views of Jews and themselves (p. 245). By 1938 eugenics was "shunned in public discourse of the day." (p. 250) Whereas such ideas were commonplace in the mainstream media in the 1920s, General George van Horn Moseley's 1938 talk on eugenics and its implications for immigration policy caused a furor when it was reported in the newspapers. Moseley was charged with anti-Semitism although he denied referring to Jews in his talk. The incident blew over, but "henceforth, the military determined to protect itself against charges of anti-Semitism that might sully its reputation or cause it political problems.... The army projected itself as an institution that would tolerate neither racism nor anti-Semitism" (p. 252-253).

Moseley himself continued to attack the New Deal, saying it was manipulated by "the alien element in our midst" (p. 253)—obviously a coded reference to Jews. This time he was severely reprimanded and the press wouldn't let it die. By early 1939, Moseley, who had retired from the army, became explicitly anti-Jewish, asserting that Jews wanted the U.S. to enter the proposed war in Europe and that the war would be waged for Jewish hegemony. He accused Jews of controlling the media and having a deep influence on the government. His anti-Semitism was crude: In 1939, he testified before the House Un-American Activities Committee on Jewish complicity in Communism and praised the Germans for dealing with the Jews properly (p. 256). But his testimony was beyond the pale by this time. As Bendersky notes, Moseley had only articulated the common Darwinian world view of the earlier generation, and he had asserted the common belief of an association of Jews with Communism. These views remained common in the army and elsewhere on the political right, but they were simply not stated publicly. And if they were, heads rolled and careers were ended.

The new climate can also be seen in the fact that Lothrop Stoddard stopped referring to Jews completely in his lectures to the Army War College in the late 1930s, but continued to advocate eugenics and was sympathetic to Nazism in the late 1930s because it took the race notion seriously. By 1940, the tables had turned. Anti-Jewish attitudes came to be seen as subversive by the government, and the FBI alerted military intelligence that Lothrop Stoddard should be investigated as a security risk in the event of war (p. 280).

From Bendersky's perspective, these changes are due largely to the triumph of science: "Not only was Stoddard's racial science erroneous, it was—despite his assertions to the contrary—out of step with the major trends in science and scholarship" (p. 262). What Bendersky does not note is that the "scienitific" refutation of the ideas of Stoddard and



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the other Darwinian theorists was entirely due to a political campaign waged in academic social science departments by Franz Boas and his students and sympathizers. The political nature of this shift in intellectual stance and its linkage to Jewish academic ethnic activists has long been apparent to scholars. (Degler, 1991; Frank, 1997; MacDonald 1998 / 2001; Stocking 1968, 1989.)

The racialist, isolationist right viewed World War II as a looming disaster. During the 1930s many officers admired the accomplishments of Nazism but worried that U.S. national interests would be sacrificed over concerns about Nazi treatment of Jews. While disapproving Hitler's Jewish policies, they often sympathized with Nazi attitudes toward Jews, feeling that the typical complaints had some basis in reality. They wanted to avoid a war with Germany as not in American national interests, distrusted Roosevelt whom they saw as wanting a war, and worried that Jews wanted a war because of their hatred for Hitler and his anti-Jewish policies. Officers often worried that Roosevelt was influenced to be anti-German by his Jewish advisors, Samuel I. Rosenman, Felix Frankfurter, and Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and they worried that Jewish interests and the British would push the U.S. into a war with Germany. There was often a perception that Jewish-controlled media emphasized Nazi anti-Jewish actions. William Langer, a Harvard historian, stated in a lecture to the War College that the rising dislike of Nazi Germany in the U.S. was due to "Jewish influence."

> You have to face the fact that some of our most important American newspapers are Jewish-controlled, and I suppose if I were a Jew I would feel about Nazi Germany as most Jews feel and it would be most inevitable that the coloring of the news takes on that tinge. As I read the New York Times, for example, it is perfectly clear that every little upset that occurs (and after all many upsets occur in a country of 70 million people) is given a great deal of prominence. The other part of it is soft-pedaled or put off with a sneer. So that in a rather subtle way, the picture you get is that there is no good in the Germans whatever" (p. 273).

Although not an officer at that time, Charles Lindbergh was the best-known example of someone with these fears. Lindbergh's thinking was shaped not only at his horror at the destructiveness of modern warfare -- the idea that World War II would be the suicide of European culture—but also that it would lead to race suicide by entering, in Lindbergh's words, into "a war in which the White race is bound to lose." Lindbergh believed that whites should join together to fend off the teeming legions of non-whites who were the real long-term threat. He



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

viewed the Soviet Union as a white bulwark against the Chinese in the East and believed that in a racial alliance based on "an English fleet, a German air force, a French army, [and] an American nation" (p. 276).

Lindbergh made his famous comment of September 11, 1941 that the influence of the Jews was one factor leading the U.S. into war, but he also noted that, "No person with a sense of dignity of mankind can condone the persecution of the Jewish race in Germany" (p. 285). Nevertheless, despite the truth of Lindbergh's comments and its temperate tone, the speech was greeted with a torrent of abuse and hatred unparalleled for a mainstream public figure in American history. Overnight Lindbergh went from cultural hero to moral pariah. Clearly by the late 1930s or early 1940s at the latest, the tide had turned.

During World War II, anti-Jewish attitudes were common in the officer corps, but "the political climate created by the Roosevelt administration had forced them into silence, particularly concerning Jews and Communists" (p. 301). It became common on the American right to see the Roosevelt administration as influenced greatly by Frankfurter and Morgenthau, as infiltrated by Jews sympathetic to the Soviet Union, and as adopting needlessly harsh policies on the Germans such as strategic bombing (p. 304). Henry Stimson, Secretary of War, "accused Morganthau and Baruch of succumbing to racial 'impulses,' calling their behavior "semitism gone wild for vengeance" (p. 313).

One indication of Jewish power at this time is that Jews were able to exert intense pressure on Eisenhower because of accommodations he made with the Vichy French and with Arabs in Morocco in order to facilitate a landing in North Africa. There was fear that lifting anti-Jewish policies in Morocco would set off an Arab riot against Jews. General George C. Patton, who had negative attitudes toward Jews, wrote to Eisenhower: "Arabs don't mind Christians, but they utterly despise Jews. The French fear that the local Jews, knowing how high their side is riding in the U.S., will try to take the lead here. If they do, the Arabs will murder them and there will be a local state of disorder." (p. 316)

Within the army, long-term thinkers believed in a need to form an alliance with the Moslem world because of oil, and they worried about "the Jew-Arab problem" even before the end of World War II. In 1948, Secretary of State George C. Marshall told Truman that his support for Israel disregarded national interests in order to obtain votes in New York. It was common among the officers to think of Israel as an intensely nationalistic, fascist-like state with a veneer of democracy. For example, during World War II a report described Zionism as "contrary to the very principles for which the Allies fought" (p. 321, noting the intense



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

collectivist tendencies of Zionism, the emphasis on the Hebrew language and militarism: "the National Socialist outlook of modern Zionism" (p. 322).

Officers commonly believed that there were many anti-German Jews in the U.S. military government after World War II who were bent on de-nazification and revenge. "Feeling inhibited from speaking publicly by alleged Jewish power, a number of officers, as well as some government officials, complained incessantly in private that Jewish 'refugees in American uniforms,' together with Jews in the U.S. government, unduly affected American policy toward Germany in a variety of detrimental ways." (p. 364) Refugee officers (i.e., German Jews returning as members of the U.S. military government) treated Germans brutally, including sadistic beatings and starvation (p. 365). In general, Jews advocated harsh treatment, the concept of collective guilt, and trials for general staff officers. The paradigm for this perspective was the Morgenthau plan which called for destruction of Germany as an industrial state and which, if implemented, would have resulted in millions of deaths. Bendersky acknowledges that many refugee Jews were in the occupation government and that they were zealous denazifiers, but says only that "some probably agreed with Morgenthau's draconian idea of punishing Germany and preventing its future resurgence" (p. 366). The reputation of these refugee officers was so bad that the Army ended up firing personnel who had entered the U.S. after 1933.

And thus the saga ends. To be sure there were many officers who retired with their beliefs intact, and some of these, such as Moseley and Albert C. Wedemeyer, became figures on the American right. In the 1970s, Wedemeyer maintained that Zionists controlled Congress and that Jews had huge political and economic power. He also blamed Jews for U.S. entry into World War II. But it was the end of an era. Bendersky, for all of his obvious hatred toward his subjects, tells a compelling story, but, in the end, one just has to believe the officers whose views he chronicles and not their chronicler.

---

*Kevin MacDonald is Professor of Psychology, California State University — Long Beach, and the author of a trilogy on Judaism as an evolutionary strategy:* ***A People That Shall Dwell Alone, Separation and Its Discontents,*** *and* ***The Culture of Critique*** *published by Praeger.*

---



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## REFERENCES

Checinski, M. *Poland: Communism, Nationalism, Anti-Semitism*, trans. (in part) T. Szafar, New York. Karz-Chol Publishing, 1982.

Cohn, W. "The politics of American Jews," *In The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group*, (ed.) M. Sklare. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1958.

Courtois, S. "Introduction: The Crimes of Communism," In Courtois, S., Werth, N., Pann , J., Paczkowski, A., Barto ½ek K., & Margolin, J. *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression*, trans. J. Murphy & M. Kramer. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Degler, C. *In Search of Human Nature: The Decline and Revival of Darwinism in American Social Thought*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Frank, G. "Jews, multiculturalism, and Boasian anthropology," *American Anthropologist* 99:731-745, 1997.

Goldstein, J. *The Politics of Ethnic Pressure: The American Jewish Committee Fight against Immigration Restriction*, 1906-1917. New York: Garland Publishing, 1990.

Klehr, H. *Communist Cadre: The Social Background of the American Communist Party Elite*, Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1978.

MacDonald, K. B. *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism*, Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998.

MacDonald, K. B. *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements*, Westport, CT: Praeger. Revised Paperback edition, 2001, Bloomington, IN: 1stbooks Library, (1998 / 2000).

Novick, P. *The Holocaust in American Life*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1999.

Pipes, R. *The Russian Revolution*, New York: Knopf, 1990.

Stocking, G. W. *Race, Evolution, and Culture: Essays in the History of Anthropology*, New York: Free Press, 1968.

Stocking, G. W. "The ethnographic sensibility of the 1920s and the dualism of the anthropological tradition," *History of Anthropology* 6:208-276. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

Svonkin, S. *Jews Against Prejudice: American Jews and the Fight for Civil Liberties*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Szajkowski, Z. "Paul Nathan, Lucien Wolf, Jacob H. Schiff and the Jewish revolutionary movements in Eastern Europe," *Jewish Social Studies*, 1967, 29(1):1-19.

Szajkowski, Z. *Jews, Wars, and Communism: The Impact of the 1919-1920 Red Scare on American Jewish Life*, New York: KTAV Publishing, 1974.

Szajkowski, Z. *Kolchak, Jews and the American Intervention in Northern Russia and Siberia, 1918-1920*, Privately published, copyright by S. Frydman, 1977.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THE LIFE OF A SPENGLERIAN VISIONARY

---

## Dreamer of the Day:

**Francis Parker Yockey and the Postwar Fascist International**

Kevin Coogan

New York: Autonomedia, 1999

$16.95 US pbk

644 pp.

---

*Reviewed by Theodore J. O'Keefe*

The American writer Francis Parker Yockey has long enjoyed cult status on the authoritarian fringe of the American far right. That the first serious attempt at a study of his life and influence, Kevin Coogan's *Dreamer of the Day*, is the work of a left-anarchist is less surprising considering that Yockey's thought and activity often defied left-right conventions. Coogan has researched this book extensively and intensively, ferreting out numerous elusive facts and long-forgotten rumors about his subject. The merit of *Dreamer of the Day*, however, is weakened by a division of emphasis signaled in its subtitle, Francis Parker Yockey and the Postwar Fascist International.

Yockey's mystique has rested in his chief work, *Imperium*, and in his mysterious death in 1960. Coogan dispels much of the murk surrounding Yockey's death, in a San Francisco jail where he was being held for passport fraud, by demonstrating that it was almost certainly suicide. His treatment of Yockey's 1948 historico-political manifesto is less definitive, for Coogan has avoided a systematic descriptive and analytical treatment of *Imperium*, by far the most substantial of Yockey's accomplishments. Instead, he has chosen to trace Yockey's shadowy and inconsequential efforts at revolutionary organizing, and to illuminate various of *Imperium*'s ideas through their (often tenuous) affinities to the thought and activities of a tenebrous group he calls "the postwar fascist international."

Coogan has done a passable job in researching the verifiable facts of Yockey's origins in solid, middle-class German stock. Born in 1917 in



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chicago, Yockey was gifted with a powerful, analytical intellect and a strong artistic sensibility; to his credit the author breaks with a common practice among politically hostile biographers by not trying to minimize his subject's abilities. Coogan industriously uncovers Yockey's vagabond college years, during which he studied at half a dozen colleges and universities, and records his intensifying involvement in writing and speaking for anti-Communist and anti-interventionist causes during the years just before America's entry into the Second World War. The author devotes similar pains to investigating Yockey's unsuccessful wartime stint in the army, which ended with his medical discharge due to a psychiatric problem (Coogan presents evidence that Yockey faked it), then trails his subject through stopgap jobs in the mid-1940s as a government attorney, including a minor role in the prosecution of second-rank "war criminals" in Germany. It must be noted that for most of these episodes, as well as for many others in Yockey's life, Coogan is overly trustful of the FBI interrogation and informant reports that his subject's intrigues evoked in the last decade of his life.

Unquestionably, as Coogan shows, Yockey's discovery of Oswald Spengler's *Decline of the West* while an undergraduate at the University of Michigan in the mid 1930s was his great epiphany. Spengler's theory of historical culture-civilizations—unique phenomena of the spirit, monadic in their isolation from one another, each moving ineluctably toward its doom—which the German author illuminated with a host of brilliant insights and intercultural comparisons in music, economics, mathematics, philosophy, city life, art, technology, literature, the natural sciences, and religiosity, to name a few, did more than dazzle and instruct its young reader: it recruited him.

In a sense Yockey's life after reading Spengler was only a prologue to his retreat in 1947 to Brittas Bay in Wicklow on the Irish Sea, where he poured out the more than six hundred pages of *Imperium* in under six months, as his life thereafter is arguably only a postscript to that book. Besides embracing the schema of "the philosopher of history," *Imperium* channels other influences, including Spengler's adamantine political musings in *The Hour of Decision* and "Prussianism and Socialism," Carl Schmitt's authoritarian theories of law and politics, and the geopolitical doctrines of Karl Haushofer and his predecessors. The book's title and imperative stem from the Spenglerian challenge to seize the moment at which each culture is destined either to perish or else to leave behind the vernal blooming of its youth, and, repelling enemies from without and within, cross over to an age of Authority and Duty (Yockey's proneness to initial capitals is unmatched by any author in English since Carlyle). In reflection of Yockey's anguish at the ruin of Europe, anno 1947, and



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his defiance at the still formally intact coalition of the Western "plutocrats" and the Eastern Bolsheviks, including the Jews who played a prominent role in both camps, *Imperium* is dedicated to "the Hero of the Second World War," unquestionably Adolf Hitler.

For the reader of a certain age and sensibilities, *Imperium* can seem a philosopher's stone, encompassing all of human history, glittering with hard insights into politics (not to mention the Jewish taboo) one could never get from one's political science class or the *National Review*, and concluding with a mighty trumpet call for the resurgence of the West. Yet the book was singularly incapable of rousing a Caesarist revolution that would cleanse Europe of its capitalist counting houses and repel "the Mongols in the Kremlin." The couple of hundred copies of *Imperium* published in 1948 and Yockey's attempts to buttonhole various Euro-fascists such as Oswald Mosley could not transcend the books's theoretical limitations and its author's own impolitic personality. Above all, however, Yockey's rejection of any possibility that America could play Rome to Europe's Greece bumped up against a Soviet threat that seemed increasingly urgent.

From here on Coogan bifurcates *Dreamer of the Day* into involved, but not always firmly supported accounts of Yockey's obscure and ineffectual efforts to implement *Imperium*'s program, and into probing the "fascist international," the author's name for a congeries of theorists and activists whose thought, Coogan believes, mirrors various of Yockey's ideas. This is something of a bad bargain for the reader interested in Yockey's life, his ideas, or his influence. In place of a measured account of any of these, Coogan recounts his subject's endless rendezvous, usually with nonentities and often observed obliquely or obscurely through unverifiable sources. A more judicious author might have supplied more focus and analysis than Coogan does to the tensions inherent in Yockey's courting of hard-core American anti-Communists (he seems even to have written a speech, refulgent with Yockeyisms, for Senator Joseph McCarthy, which, alas, the senator never delivered), and in his attempts to cultivate the Soviet Union, recently purged of its Jewish influences, against an America that showed no signs of freeing itself from the "Culture Distorter." Aside from these efforts (which may well have included borderline espionage activity in concert with Soviet bloc secret services), it would probably have sufficed to observe that Yockey, badly misreading the spirit of the age, had strived to realize his dream of revolutionary Caesarism in not only an America, but also a Europe, in which pragmatism, materialism, and optimism easily trumped Yockey's heroic cultural pessimism and self-sacrificing idealism.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Long stretches of *Dreamer of the Day* are devoted to surveying a variegated plenitude of mostly European thinkers, many of them former Italian Fascisti or German authoritarians, National Socialists or not, who claimed to reject what they saw as Hitler's reductive racialism, especially his aversion to Slavic Russia, and were often ready to make common cause with non-Westerners, from the Soviets to Nasser to Castro, against the enervating American influence. Here the author can be instructive and occasionally diverting, but his treatment of political and philosophical ideas paralleling those of his subject is often misleading or irrelevant, in terms of actual influence in either direction. A positive review of *Imperium* from the pen of the fascist esoteric Julius Evola or former SS officer and propagandist Johann von Leers suffices to send Coogan off on chapter-long vagaries on Atlantis and the Hypoboreans or the far-flung (and seemingly far-fetched) archeological expeditions of the SS Ahnenerbe, which are often followed by histories of political efforts with only the most tangential connection to Yockey.

Worse, the author has let his enthusiasm for such distracting diversions seduce him into unwarranted speculations on what he calls the Order, "a new kind of Knights Templar designed to successfully function sub rosa" (p. 320). Coogan provides no substantiation for the existence of this corps d'élite of fascist adepts, which he elsewhere imagines to have been linked in the 1940s and '50s by "a devil's pact" to Eisenhower's CIA chief, Allen Dulles. Coogan's attempts to link Yockey to the Order are no more effective than his dabblings in the mystical interests of its members. Coogan's opinion that "By tapping into methods used in the occult and Traditional world, Evola developed extremely powerful MKULTRA-like thought-control techniques" (p. 336) will raise eyebrows among his more phlegmatic readers, some of whom may also wonder why there is no reference to a source for it on one of the several score of pages of reference notes included in this book.

In the strictest interpretation, *Dreamer of the Day* is neither a proper biography nor a history of ideas nor a reliable account of the anti-bourgeois right in either Europe or America during the 1950s. A two-hundred-page biography that is more focused, more critical of its sources, more judicious in weighing Yockey's actual effect as a thinker, an organizer, and a revolutionary is still called for. For all its defects, however, *Dreamer of the Day* has its uses, as an introduction to a past current of thought and (attempted) action in defense of the West that fairly glitters beside the turgid and predictable efforts of North American "conservatives" over the past half century. Coogan is often an engaging writer, with for the most part an objectivity, a sense of humor, and a genuine interest in the doings of his subjects rare among leftists



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

depicting rightists (and vice versa). Despite his lapses, Coogan has been for the most part quite up to the task of depicting a swarm of characters far more diverse and interesting than any comparable collection of leftists or "movement" conservatives. When all is thought and written, it's hard to damn an author who (discoursing on the polymorphous sexuality of the American propagandist for Germany Sylvester Viereck) can produce a line like, "From his youth onwards he also had a fondness for orgies."

---

*Theodore J. O'Keefe is associate editor of* ***The Occidental Quarterly.***

---



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Introducing

# WASHINGTON SUMMIT PUBLISHERS

*Contemporary Works ⚜ Classic Reprints*

- Anthropology
- Current Events
- Evolution
- Genetics
- Philosophy
- Psychology

WASHINGTON SUMMIT PUBLISHERS (WSP) now offers contemporary works and classic reprints (which include recently abridged versions and texts drawn from earlier works) in the social sciences with particular emphasis on anthropology, evolution and genetics, philosophy, politics and current events, and psychology.

Currently WSP has 12 titles available in its Classic Reprint Series and 30 titles in the Contemporary Titles Series (titles and rights recently purchased from *Scott-Townsend Publishers.*) Books from WASHINGTON SUMMIT PUBLISHERS are available by order from all major book retailers, or may be purchased directly via the Internet. A complete catalog of the WSP line of publications is available upon inquiry from the address below.

WASHINGTON SUMMIT PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 3514 • Augusta, GA 30914

Ph: 706-736-4884 • Fax: 706-733-7652

Books@WSPublishers.com • http://WSPublishers.com



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THE JEWISH QUESTION ONCE AGAIN

---

**The Culture of Critique:**
**An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements**
Kevin MacDonald
Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 1998
$65.00

vii + 379pp.

---

*Reviewed by Hugh Perry*

Ever since the European Enlightenment and the subsequent political empowerment of the Jewish people, Jews have played an ever greater role in Western politics and culture. And, as the people of this unique nation have become ever more successful and powerful, European men have debated the significance of the "Jewish question." Generally speaking, it has been those Europeans most intent on preserving and protecting their religions, cultures, and races that have viewed the Jews as a potential or actual social threat. In turn, Jewry has invariably advocated different forms of "pluralism" and sought to weaken, discredit, and destroy these European defenders and the institutions they defend. The "Jewish Question," then, is: Who are the Jews and what is and should be their role in societies in which they are a minority?

The conflict between Jews and their critics or enemies has colored many of the past century's political struggles. Jewish ascendancy has meant the victory of cosmopolitanism and individualism with the accompanying breakdown and decline of the identities and traditions of the peoples who have hosted the Jews. This process, although at times halted by assorted counter-revolutionary movements, has been totally triumphant since the Second World War. The years prior to and during the war saw the success of many political movements committed to national, cultural, and racial loyalties. Nearly all of them sought to eliminate or at least limit Jewish influence and power.

Many writers have remarked that Jewish advocacy of mass immigration and other policies that undermine European identity is



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

indicative of deceit. Jewry advocates pluralism and diversity and the end of distinct cultural and racial survival only for non-Jews, while jealously guarding their own survival, either as a self-conscious subgroup within gentile nations or in the manifestly Jewish homeland, Israel.

Indeed, recent decades have brought the power organizations of Jewry into conflict with other non-European peoples (Arabs, American blacks, and others) seeking to understand and express themselves as separate entities. It is no longer white nationalism alone that Jewry seeks to demonize but other group loyalties as well. Yet the degree of power that organizational and financial Jewry wield in America and in much of Europe makes the mere mention of these subjects taboo. Or, as Joe Sobran often puts it — We are to believe that Jewish power doesn't exist, and if you say it does, it'll destroy you!

## Documentation of the Struggle

The literature on the Jewish question is as old as the original interaction between other peoples and the Jewish nation in antiquity. However, the problems unique to our era, rooted as they are in the post-Enlightenment extension of citizenship to Jews, form a distinct subcategory among the themes of the writings on the Jewish issue. The threat, such as it was, posed to Catholic, royalist, feudal Europe, for example, was far different and certainly far less mortal than that posed by Jews possessed today of equal rights and enormous wealth, power, and communications media influence.

Generally speaking, one must search in old libraries for works long out-of-print or in the book lists of marginalized organizations to find any attempt to discuss Jewish influence with honesty. Unfortunately, it is there that one often encounters a certain feverish rhetoric born of the extended suffering of a people enduring dispossession. Thus, for decades it has been almost impossible to find in book form a serious, scholarly, and dispassionate discussion of this vexing issue. This limiting circumstance has today been forever altered by the classic and now in some circles very well known trilogy of Professor Kevin MacDonald.

Published by Praeger of Westport, Connecticut, MacDonald's books, *A People that Shall Dwell Alone* (1996), *Separation and Its Discontents* (1998) and *The Culture of Critique* (1998) bring a high degree of intellectual sophistication and scholarship to the Jewish question. The author launches no emotional jihads. In fact, until the end of the last volume there is little hint of where he feels the data he has amassed should lead the reader.

Essentially, MacDonald believes that Judaism is a "group evolutionary strategy." It has emphasized several qualities such as "separation, altruism and community control" that have enabled Jews



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to endure throughout the centuries when other ancient peoples have long since disappeared. In addition, MacDonald sees Jewry as having "emphasized eugenic practices and cultural practices that foster a specific set of phenotypic traits (especially intelligence, high–investment parenting and allegiance to the group) that are advantageous in stratified human societies. By specializing in these traits, Jews have been able to compete successfully with gentile members of many societies for positions in which literacy and intelligence are important." As time has gone by "Jews have become specialized for occupational niches at the upper levels of the human energy pyramid." They are the "consumers of energy produced by lower—status gentile members of society, laboring in the areas of primary production."

However, MacDonald's thesis goes much further. It is not simply a case of the Jews doing better than gentiles in certain basic skills and thereby enabling themselves to the fruits of their labor. The Jews also pursue a policy of criticizing gentile social assumptions and stability and seek to undermine the group homogeneity of gentile societies. "To a considerable extent," MacDonald writes, "the *fons et origo* of the social policies and cultural shifts that have resulted in the dangerous situation now rapidly developing in the United States has been the Jewish dominated intellectual and political movements..." The Jewish strategy has gone so far that today it is "questionable" whether in the immediate future "Western individualist societies are able to defend the legitimate interests of the European-derived peoples."

MacDonald ably demonstrates the prominent role that Jews have played in those intellectual movements of the twentieth century that have effectively destroyed Western gentile cultures' self perception. This critique has been launched on two fronts. Through Freudianism, Marxism, and the Old and New Lefts it has made war against the religious, moral, aesthetic, and behavioral norms of gentile groups. Second, in their role as originators and popularizers of the Boasian view of anthropology and the Frankfort School of Social Research, Jews have sought to discredit all gentile group allegiances as either illusory (Franz Boas) or mentally deranged (Frankfort School). To a large extent many of the conclusions of all the above critiques form the ruling ideology of contemporary America and Europe.

## Aping the Jewish Model

Yet in the end, McDonald is cautiously optimistic. He feels that the surrender of the white world is an "unprecedented unilateral abdication" and that "an evolutionist would expect no such abdication without at least a phase of resistance by a significant segment of the



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

population." This resistance will "emulate aspects of Judaism by adopting group-serving, collective ideologies and social organizations." This "strategic mimicry" will, ironically, amount to a " 'Judaization' of western societies."

Thus whether the white world goes under as a result of Jewish influences or saves itself by imitating Jewish strategy the "profound impact of Judaism" is unavoidable.

Or, as Revilo Oliver described matters in 1981,

> [T]he Jews, whose racial cohesion has made them a superorganism, are undoubtedly a superior species.... That you may disapprove of their methods or their character is irrelevant. They have given proof of biological superiority.

Yet, Oliver parts company from MacDonald's guarded optimism as to the future.

> So far as one can extrapolate from the present, disregarding our pathetic hopes for a psychological and biological miracle, there is one race, which by its own fatuity and degeneracy, seems likely to become extinct less than a century after it was master of the world.

## WHO DUNNIT?

In MacDonald's description of Judaic influences the picture is of conflict between Jews and non-Jews. Missing is the simple fact that for many gentiles there is no such conflict and has not been one for centuries. As just quoted, Oliver maintained that the decline of the white world is to be found in "its own fatuity and degeneracy."

This was also the position of another famous student of the Jewish question, Ivor Benson. He wrote in 1986,

> The entire burden of the responsibility for what Spengler called the 'decline of the west' must rest squarely on the shoulders of the peoples of the west, and not on the Jews, for the peoples of the west have themselves created the morally unhygienic social and political conditions that render them susceptible to debilitating influences which hitherto they were able to resist quite easily. In other words, modern Jewish predominance is not the cause of Western decadence but only one of its more conspicuous symptoms.

Granting MacDonald's notion of the negative effects of a Jewry struggling throughout the centuries for resources, survival and finally power with their varied gentile adversaries, the larger question is: Are we witnessing an ultimate cause of European decline or simply one of its more viral symptoms?

For example, in the field of nonwhite immigration to America and other western lands, MacDonald assembles the data to prove that



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organizational Jewry has always supported this massive invasion. What he ignores is that it has also been supported by gentile capitalism desiring cheap labor and gentile liberals desiring self destruction. Without these two sources of support, the 1965 Immigration Act could never have been passed. Indeed, it has ever been so. The needs of large property owners in ante-bellum Dixie led to the creation of America's black problem. American colonization and continued meddling in the affairs of Puerto Rico led to that post war mass immigration.

MacDonald fails to diagnose the change in white mentality over the years and primarily after the second World War. It was this failure of will, desire for profit or simple self-hate which allowed Jewish propaganda to fall on fertile ground.

A correct answer to the source of gentile weakness is not merely academic. If, in the words of Pogo, "We have met the enemy and he is us," then unless the white man first recovers some semblance of positive racial identity he will be incapable of understanding, let alone confronting massed forces of unbridled capitalism, liberal self-hate, and Jewish subversion.

To this reviewer it seems absurd that less than two percent of the population could effectively dictate to the remaining ninety-eight percent how to live their lives without significant assent on the part of the overwhelming majority. It is here that we come upon a question that critics of the Jews have yet to confront openly. At present, given the reality that most middle and upper class whites are still able to avoid living in multiracial areas, they care little about white identity. Most whites find the empty consumerism, so passionately denounced in conservative and racialist literature, pleasant enough. They no longer respond to appeals to group loyalty and survival.

This, of course, presents a problem for MacDonald's theory of predetermined, endless group struggle. It leads him to posit some form of inevitable white resistance in the future. Perhaps, though, the MacDonald model does not take into account the simple historical given of civilizational death. Whole peoples seem, at some point in their history, to run out of gas. They slip into a selfish individualism that values personal and perhaps familial comfort and fulfillment over a larger loyalty to groups. This seems to be the state of the white race worldwide today.

Indeed, this self-absorption affects even Jewry. Large numbers of Jews now simply marry outside their group and are lost to it. Current estimates run as high as 50 percent. Nevertheless, enough Jews remain loyal (to their nation, not to their faith; very few observe its precepts or regularly attend synagogue). This loyalty, often fierce, is most manifest today in three areas: support for Israel, remembrance of the Holocaust,



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the destruction through all means available (law, social ostracism, financial ruin, and physical intimidation) of all gentile identity-based nationalisms, which are invariably denounced as "anti-Semitism" of one kind or another. In the end, the gentile infected by an extraordinary communal apathy is no match for Jewish power.

## Is There a Conspiracy?

One of the strengths of the MacDonald trilogy is that it avoids the hysteria that has typified most rightist studies of this issue in the past. The reader will search in vain for talk of Learned Elders meeting in cemeteries or secret cabals stretching back to the satanic Illuminati and currently directed by "Insiders" from their secret headquarters in Manhattan. This "Spy vs. Spy" picture of reality may satisfy the Maxwell Smart inside us all but does little to help grasp the real nature of the Jewish assault.

Organizational Jewry is neither secretive as to its goals nor taking orders from a mysterious Mr. Big somewhere. It says quite openly that it is working for a society devoid of any identity base. On a host of internal Jewish issues Jews evidence great diversity. In fact, the animosity that different segments of Jewry feel for each other is clearly real. There is no monolith. What gentile society encounters is something perhaps even more troubling, an almost subconscious yet instinctive loyalty to Jewish self interest utterly oblivious to the similar needs of others.

## Towards a Just Jewish Policy

Let us assume for a moment that the real enemy is, indeed, "us." Accordingly, the problem posed by the impact of Jewish power must be postponed till whites reacquire a sense of their own group identity and a desire to survive. Yet, at that point, if and when the white counter-revolution sweeps into power, what should be its approach towards the Jewish question?

Here we doubtless encounter a wide diversity of opinion among those gentiles who understand the nature of the Jewish assault. There are those who remain forever committed to libertarian and constitutional ideals who feel that a return to the traditional freedoms of the Anglo-Saxon heritage will do away with the prominent dangers of the rising tide of color and the Jewish problem. If we only allow individuals and states to follow their own desires and ideas, then the Jewish power wielded via the federal government and controlled media will become irrelevant.

This view would assert that a truly free press and media would allow for an open and honest debate on the role of Jewish power and its intentions in general society. By allowing for free debate on the subject, Jews will no longer be able to demonize, persecute, and ostracize those who oppose them. Yet it is unclear how the current crop of media and



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government "leaders," almost uniformly subservient to Jewish power, are to be replaced. And, if they are not to be replaced, how is the public to be exposed to a free exchange of ideas?

For those who have abandoned or who never harbored sympathies for constitutional republicanism, it would seem that in addition to exposing the duplicity of Jewish political advocacy, there remains a need to place some limits on Jewish social and cultural involvement. Perhaps, a demonstration of long-term loyalty on the part of families or individuals would be the basis for participation in the nation's governance.

Alternatively, there was the policy, advanced by G. K. Chesterton and Hilaire Belloc in the early part of the 20th century, to grant the Jews autonomy within gentile states but withhold from them national citizenship. This policy may be well in keeping with what some have seen as the necessary division of America into autonomous zones or lands, each populated by a different race or ethnicity.

It remains possible that, when our civilization reaches the pivotal battles with liberalism and the rising colored populations, many Jews will finally see the error of their ways and the self-destructive consequences of the policies and values they have promoted. There are some indications of this already among some Jews who, to one degree or another, have begun to abandon or at least mute the liberalism and radicalism that have been characteristic of Jewish politics.

## Speculation for Now

At present all thoughts concerning the nature of gentile opposition to Jewish power are purely speculative, however. Despite the thorough job MacDonald has done in documenting the Jewish role in white and particularly American decline, unless whites disclose an interest in something besides their own individual well-being, our author's efforts will be no more than the work of a latter day Gibbon.

Long-time observers note that the numbers and levels of interest of people now involved in white survival movements is today perhaps higher than it has been since the smothering of Southern resistance to racial desegregation four decades ago. Whether this growing and devoted band will ever be capable of convincing the majority of opting for survival is, at this stage, very far from clear.

---

*Hugh Perry is a North American academic who has long studied the Jewish question and has come to fear an open confrontation with Jewish power.*

---



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Do You Want Your Children to be Racial Minorities?

If we let current trends continue, by the year 2050 whites will be a minority race in the United States. Will that be good for your country or your children?

Current race and immigration policies assume that race is something trivial that can be made not to matter. This is false. Race helps determine where most of us live, where we send our children to school, whom we marry, and what church we join. **Race will also determine the character of our country.** If we acquire a Third World population we will become a Third World country.

*American Renaissance* is a monthly newsletter that expresses an unabashed preference for the culture and way of life of the Euro-American majority. We have been publishing for 12 years, and our contributors include **Samuel Francis, Michael Levin, Jared Taylor, Richard Lynn,** and **Fr. James Thornton.**

Subscriptions are $24.00 for 12 monthly issues.

**Subscriber** (your name will not be given out to anyone)

**Name:** _____

**Address:** _____

**Address:** _____

Please make $24.00 check payable to:
**American Renaissance**, Box 527, Oakton, VA 22124

**Tel: (703) 716-0900** **Fax: (703) 716-0932** **www.AmRen.com**




LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# IDEOLOGY CONTRA-SCIENCE

**The Emperor's New Clothes:**
**Biological Theories of Race at the Millennium**
By Joseph L. Graves Jr.
New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001
$28 US

252pp

*Reviewed by Glayde Whitney*

## PART I: GENETICS OF RACE IN HOMO SAPIENS

According to *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* (on line) an ideology is:

> ***1****: visionary theorizing.* ***2 a****: a systematic body of concepts especially about human life or culture* ***b****: a manner or the content of thinking characteristic of an individual, group, or culture* ***c****: the integrated assertions, theories and aims that constitute a sociopolitical program.*

Visionary theorizing along with assertions, theories and aims that constitute a sociopolitical program has been of profound importance throughout written history. But it is not science.

Science is a method of gaining information, in which claims of fact are based on observable evidence. In science observations are made, observed facts are organized, and theories are constructed to account for the observations. Then predicting the results of further observations tests the theories. The hallmark of honest science is to follow the data [observations] wherever they may lead. Science is not about whether or not you like the results, or whether finding some particular result would facilitate or impede a preferred sociopolitical program. Science is about *what is.*

Science is the only approach to knowledge yet discovered that is inherently self-correcting. Mistakes may be made, theories may error, but when conducted honestly science is self-correcting. It is instructive



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to recall the motto of the world's first scientific organization, the British Royal Society: *Nullius in Verba*, "On no man's word, show me the evidence."

Karl Marx concocted an ideology, which he called a science ("scientific socialism"), probably because science was widely respected in 19th century Europe. But it was and is not a science; rather it was and is an ideology. In Marx's visionary theorizing all of the social ills and inequities among mankind are due entirely to human exploitation. Central planning along with the elimination of private property would lead to a better and more equitable world for all (today often referred to as "social justice" or "true justice").

In Marx's writing Charles Darwin is held in high esteem, largely for having developed a purely materialistic theory of the origin of man (no need for "the opiate of the masses"), and for the notion of evolutionary progress. In Marx's theorizing the natural outcome of man's progressive evolution will be socialism/communism. By a strange quirk of fate Marx knew nothing of Mendel's work and what would become the science of genetics.

Thus, when the Bolsheviks implemented Marxist/Leninism under communism in the Soviet Union, Darwin was revered while Mendel was excoriated. Evolution *yes* but inherited individual and group differences *no*. If individual and group differences were to some extent caused by inherited genetic differences instead of being the sole result of previous oppression, then socialist sociopolitical programs might not be capable of creating a utopian egalitarian society.

The resulting ideological travesty in the Soviet Union that came to substitute for honest biological science is called "Lysenkoism," after one of its main proponents. But it is important to realize that Trofim Lysenko did not subvert science by himself: the vast majority of biologists and previous-geneticists were willing to play the game. The alternative option was first social opprobrium, later exile, Gulag, and sometimes death.

The Lysenkoist "science" held that genetics, called "Morganism-Mendelism" was a western bourgeoisie fiction invented to justify slavery and oppression. The ideological position was that actually genes caused none of the differences among people or animals or plants. Instead all differences were due to the environmental conditions under which critters grew up. Proper "vernalization" (*i.e.* Head Starts) could turn one type into another, as required by Marxist/Leninist ideology.[1]

The fellow most credited with introducing this bilge into American science is Franz Boas, a late-nineteenth century German-Jewish immigrant. Franz Boas is justly famous as the founder of "cultural"



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anthropology and was one of the most active propagandists of the communist ideology that race differences are caused not by genes, but by accidents of history and differences in environmental opportunities. As early as 1894 Boas was arguing that biological race was not a factor in intelligence or ability.[2]

Boas himself proffered that the source of his ideas "was a German home in which the ideals of the Revolution of 1848 were a living force."[3] (Notably the failed communist revolution that took place shortly after publication of *The Communist Manifesto.*) More a social activist than scientist, Boas was a member of over 40 organizations deemed communist or communist fronts. His work was funded in part by the same Jacob Schiff[4] who financially assisted in undermining the Czarist regime, which eventually led to the Russian revolution. Boas' prime solution for "racism" was to deny inherited differences while encouraging miscegenation.[2,3]

This is exactly the genre into which Professor Graves' little book *The Emperor's New Clothes* fits. We are told on the first page that

> The story of the emperor's new clothes has become the time-proven metaphor for patently false theories. … However, Anderson's fairy tale does not communicate the dire need to eliminate racist ideology. In his tale, the emperor is simply vain and foolish. Vanity and foolishness, though indeed problems, are not as grave as racism. Racism is more than foolish; it is evil and destructive. I have written this book because I believe that our society cannot progress toward true justice and equality until we exorcise racism from our collective consciousness.

The introductory chapter proceeds to set the scene:

> Demolishing the idea of biological race lays bare the fallacies of racism. If biological races do not exist, then what we call 'race' is the invention not of nature but of our social institutions and practices. The social nature of racial categories is significant because social practice can be altered far more readily than can genetic constitution.

It continues:

> My personal experiences with racism as an African American intellectual have certainly given me perspective on the harm caused by racist thinking and practice. … racial exploitation gave the United States license to exist. … Thomas Jefferson and some other signatories of the Declaration of Independence were slaveholders. … Throughout our history, Anglo-Saxons and other northwestern European populations have often enjoyed prosperity at the expense of other groups. … the American concept of race is a social construction, resulting from the unique political and cultural history of the United States. … Only political orthodoxy in a racially stratified society has maintained the race concept for this long. If race does not exist at the biological level, then its use in social and political policy is profoundly flawed. Indeed, it is a falsehood in the service of social oppression. … Finally, racist myths encourage support for the existing order.

Whew! If this sounds like an old-fashioned revolutionary communist



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tirade, well, it is. Yes, yes, I know it has become *faux pas* to mention "communism" in this politically correct era, but, well, it is. Of course one could accuse me of selectively quoting out of context. If you suspect that, then read it for yourself. But please do not support this tripe by purchasing it, wait until it is available from some library. The biggest surprise after reading the whole thing is that a supposedly reputable university press accepted this pseudo-scientific volume for publication. But before getting ahead of myself, here is the substance of the case. The main empirical claims, both at the beginning and the end, are

> The simple fact … that science identifies no races in the human species, not because we wish there to be no races but because the peculiar evolutionary history of our species has not led to their formation. There is more genetic variability in one tribe of East African chimpanzees than in the entire human species! … (p. 9).

> *The level of genetic variation that exists in the human species is not close to being high enough to allow the definition of subspecies (or races). … Population genetics allows us to apprehend the fact that there are no biological or geographical races within the modern human species (pp. 70-71).*

To investigate the veracity of the "no biological races" assertion, we need to consider at minimum two empirical claims. First, how much genetic variation is there among humans? Professor Graves claims very little, largely because of the recent emergence of modern man. Second, whatever genetic variation there is, how is it apportioned among various historical geographical populations? Graves admits selection for different genes under different environmental conditions, but argues that there has always been so much gene flow [miscegenation] among all geographical groups that none have differentiated genetically from others. The claim is that what small amount of genetic variation exists is overwhelmingly distributed among individuals within local populations, and essentially none differentiates one population [race] from another.

So, first, how much genetic variation is there among humans? The new methods of molecular genetics, developed only in the last few decades, allow genetic claims to be tested with a precision never before possible. And in a strange way the politically correct rhetoric is getting further and further away from the scientific facts. For example, gaining attention for politically correct race denial is J. Craig Venter, chief scientist at Celera Genomics. At every opportunity, from White House press conference to formal interview, Venter assures us that sequencing the human genome has proven that races do not exist; "Race has no genetic or scientific basis." We are all too similar genetically for race to have a genetic basis. Venter was already making such proclamations when Celera had almost completed sequencing the DNA from exactly one



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

individual—probably Venter himself. However, since then Celera has begun selling access to its SNP database. SNP, Single Nucleotide Polymorphism [called 'snip'], is what used to be called a "spot mutation." Change one nucleotide in a gene and the resulting protein can sometimes have a very different function (Sickle Cell Anemia, an example used repeatedly by Professor Graves, is the result of one nucleotide substitution in the gene that codes for hemoglobin). Different SNPs of the same gene are alternative alleles, or forms, of that gene.

Celera's ad in the April 6, 2001 issue of *Science* offers access to "2.8 Million Unique SNPs Mapped to the Human Genome." Wow, at present it appears that the human genome has around 30,000 coding genes (some think more like 80,000), and here already is a treasure trove of almost 3 million alternative forms. Where did Celera find all these variants? Almost all are from sequencing the genomes of only five individuals. As J. Craig Venter explained on a recent PBS NOVA program—two Caucasians, one Oriental, one African, and one Hispanic.

Meanwhile at Celera's competitor Genaissance Pharmaceuticals, "We've looked at the largest number of individuals and diverse populations that's ever been done," said Gerald Vovis, Genaissance chief technology officer. They analyzed 313 genes from 82 Americans of four racial backgrounds; 21 whites, 20 blacks, 20 Asians, 18 Latinos, and three Native Americans. Researchers at Genaissance analyzed SNPs by looking at closely bunched sets that are inherited together, called haplotypes. Scientists estimate that there are about 30 million SNPs among humans, but Genaissance's team thinks analysis based on haplotypes is likely to be more helpful in medicine than analyses with individual SNPs. The number of different haplotypes for each of the 313 genes varied from two to 53, with an average of 14. Thus while a single human has only two sets (one from mom, one from pop), each of 30,000 genes, among all of mankind there could be 30 million variants arranged as 400,000 to 500,000 haplotype sets. The company says it hopes to catalogue the haplotypes of every human gene by analyzing DNA of 90 people from Africa, Asia and Europe.[5]

Well then, with regard to the first empirical question: how much genetic variation is there among humans? Quite a lot. When emphasizing genetic similarity among all humans, it is often repeated that we are all the same for 99.9 percent of our genetic code. We differ one from another, on average, for only 0.1 percent of our nucleotides. However, one-out-of-a-thousand of the 3.2 billion nucleotides that make up the human genome leaves room for a lot of genetic variation. Throughout the species we have on the order of tens of millions of SNP variations and maybe over 400,000 variant haplotypes. Recall that Professor Graves wrote, "*There is more genetic variability in one tribe of East*



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

*African chimpanzees than in the entire human species!"*(p. 9). That must be some tribe of chimps—for chumps.

For the first question, there is plenty of genetic variation so that, if distributed as patterned differences among geographic populations, humanity could be composed of a number of genetically differentiated subspecies (races).

The second question then, how is the genetic variation apportioned among people and groups around the globe? Prof. Graves is unequivocal:

> Despite the unambiguous character of the recent studies of human genetic diversity, the significance of these results for our understanding of socially constructed races has not been fully appreciated. The fact that no races exist in our species has not been adequately communicated to the lay public. (p.156)… The fallacy of the biological race concept must be incorporated into our collective thinking on an everyday basis. (p.195)… The United States still suffers from the huge political and economic disparities between those derived from northern European ancestry and those who are not. (p.196)… How can we design programs that progressively eliminate the detriments caused by the history of racist injustice… A cornerstone in this struggle will be the wide dissemination of the fact of the non-existence of biological races. (p.197).

This clearly smacks of ideology more than science. But what of the science behind "the fact of the non-existence of biological races?" One recent article from *Science*, the premiere American science journal, contained the statement, "Ethnicity can be inferred from the frequencies of alternative forms, or alleles, of genes; allele patterns differ by racial origin." The article also pointed out the ease of identifying the race of a suspect from DNA in criminal cases.[6]

There are now known to be many genes (alleles), which are present in certain races but entirely absent among others. Even more common are genes that are present in various races, but at different frequencies. In recent years almost every issue of scientific journals, such as the *American Journal of Human Genetics*, contain articles dealing with genetic differences among "ethnic groups." Representative is a 1997 *AJHG* paper entitled "Ethnic-affiliation estimation by use of population-specific DNA markers."[7] "Ethnic-affiliation" (AKA race) of an individual can in most instances be ascertained with near-certainty from analysis of DNA contained in a drop of blood or saliva.

A sampling of research reported within the last decade includes Cavalli-Sforza and colleagues' genetic comparisons of different "populations." Professor emeritus Cavalli-Sforza, the most prominent living geneticist to spend his career investigating human genetic variation, loudly proclaims at every opportunity that races do not exist; he says he studies the genetics of "populations," not races. For the monumental work *The History and Geography of Human Genes*[8], Cavalli-



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sforza and colleagues collected data for about 100,000 gene frequencies from approximately 2,000 populations distributed around the world. That work used gene products, protein polymorphisms [blood antigens, enzymes, structural proteins, etc.]. They are adamant that they are not studying races, but rather populations of humans. Yet their nine main clusters, based on genetic similarity and differences have a familiar ring: "Africans (sub-Saharan), Caucasoids (European)… Northern Mongoloids…" (p. 79). In their words, from their genetic data, "the greatest difference within the human species is between Africans and non-Africans.… The cluster formed by Caucasoids, northern Mongoloids, and Amerinds is reasonably compact in all analyses" (p.83).

Another gene frequency survey was reported by the noted geneticists Nei and Roychoudhury[9], who looked at the distribution of 121 alleles of 29 genes among 26 sample populations. Their study also analyzed 15 populations with data for 33 variable genes. They report that the first major split of the phylogenetic tree separates Africans from non-Africans and that this split occurs with a 100 percent bootstrap probability. The second split separates Caucasian populations from all other non-African populations, and this split is also supported by bootstrap tests. The third major split occurs between Native American populations and the Greater Asians that include East Asians (mongoloids), Pacific Islanders, and Australopapuans (native Australians and Papua New Guineans), but Australopapuans are genetically quite different from the rest of the Greater Asians.

As mentioned by Prof. Graves, it so happens that there are three different patterns of gene inheritance that provide different information about relationships. First there are genes on chromosomes called autosomes that are inherited equally from both parents. Second, there are genes in mitochondria, called mtDNA, that are usually inherited only from the mother. Third, there are genes on the Y-chromosome that are transmitted only from father to son. The two studies mentioned above involved mostly genes on the autosomes. Another study compared Y-chromosome gene markers among a diversity of European, Mid-Eastern, North African and sub-Saharan (black) "populations." They found that "sub-Saharan African populations were characterized by an almost completely different set of [markers]", while the other (mostly Caucasian derived) groups shared many of the same markers, but at different frequencies.[10] Another study that looked at mtDNA found a complete separation between sub-Saharan Africans and other humans.[11]

The above genetic data from Nei and Roychoudhury were later subjected to a statistical procedure called factor analysis with varimax rotation. This is a strictly numerical procedure that reveals which



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

components, if any, cluster together. By these standard statistical procedures the genetic data from the 26 populations clearly yielded six distinct clusters. The six clusters are easily identified as the following "population" groups: [1] Mongoloids, [2] Caucasoids, [3] South Asians and Pacific Islanders, [4] Negroids, [5] North and South Amerinds plus Eskimos, [6] aboriginal Australians and Papuan New Guineans.[12]

These examples illustrate the scientific [data based] fact that modern studies of genetic diversity are converging on a human population genetic structure that is very similar to the racial classifications provided from the work of classical physical anthropologists. *These genetic data are a virtually irrefutable demonstration of the biological reality of race*: purely statistical analyses of allele frequencies gives results that are essentially identical to the racial groupings established by traditional physical anthropology.

Along with Lysenko and Professor Graves, as much as we might wish that biological (genetic) races do not exist, it simply isn't so. Biological race and "socially constructed" racial categories do not always map well onto one another, but simply denying the reality of biological races is not a useful route to "social justice."

Scattered amongst the deniers of the genetic reality of biological race, some thinkers continually grapple with reality. For example, African American Troy Duster (Sociology Professor, UC Berkeley) addressed a conference on "DNA and the Criminal Justice System" sponsored by the National Commission on the Future of DNA Evidence.[13] Among Professor Duster's comments we find:

> I want to address some of the inadvertent, sometimes hidden subterranean consequences of the DNA revolution in forensics. The CODIS database has hovering around it, it seems to me, a 400-pound gorilla, the social, political, cultural phenomena called – we use to call it race. Now we call it population-specific allele frequencies.
>
> And I say 'use to' because molecular biology has informed us at that level, race is non-existent. There are no discrete taxonomies which make any sense. Instead to be scientifically correct, we say population-specific frequencies. Indeed the UNESCO statement on race in 1995 signed on to by about eight disciplines said that race as a concept has no utility in science (p. 194).
>
> Now if race has no utility what are we to make of a series of articles that appeared in the last decade looking for gene markers of population groups that coincide with common sense versions of phenotypes by racial designation (p. 195).
>
> …[there is] "what I'll call the obfuscation of race at the level of molecular biology, while at the same time it's being deployed on the streets, and I think even in scientific laboratories where it's got a new nomenclature.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> I was simply trying to point out that microbiology and indeed genetics has caught itself in a massive contradiction on the question of race, and that while we may successfully fool ourselves into believing that – we've now changed the language and therefore the phenomena – Upon closer inspection, we're going to find a lot more empirical investigations into the population frequencies that are going to coincide with race,… (p.204).

It is fitting that Professor Graves chose to title his little book "*The Emperor's New Clothes,*" since he tells us that the story of the emperor's new clothes has become the time-proven metaphor for patently false theories.

## PART II: BIOBABBLE AND SIMPLE RUBBISH

The first portion of this book review / essay concentrated on establishing the genre (Marxist agitprop) and scientific validity (non-existent) of the main arguments of Grave's *The Emperor's New Clothes.* This second installment will present and comment on some of the specific claims and assertions, most of which strike the reviewer as simply silly at best and useless bio-babble at worst. Still in all fairness, a few insightful passages were found.

The book starts right out with an introduction titled "Racial Thinking." Graves puts the non-scientific, ideological agenda right up front:

> Racist ideologues have been accustomed to the luxury of hiding behind so-called reasoned objective argument while characterizing their critics as emotional or 'politically correct.' By demonstrating that racist science is critically flawed, we lay bare their hidden agenda (p. 2).

> Racism is more than foolish, it is evil and destructive. I have written this book because I believe that our society cannot progress toward true justice and equality until we exorcize racism from our collective consciousness (p. 1).

Graves continues;

> [R]acial exploitation gave the United States license to exist (p. 3)... If race does not exist at the biological level, then its use in social and political policy is profoundly flawed. Indeed, it is falsehood in the service of social oppression (p. 9).

Whatever these socially-concerned views may be, science they are not.

Chapter one deals with early theories of race, from biblical accounts through early Greek classifications, the Roman Emperor Julian the Apostate's racial theory, and Medieval Europe. The presentation of



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

historical views is in the main interesting, although flawed by shaky scholarship. Aristotle's famous chain of being, his *scalae naturae* is mentioned as central to later racial hierarchies, as is "his" (sic) book *Systema Naturae.* Of course the basis of modern taxonomic classification, presented in *Systema Naturae* was not provided by Aristotle (384–322 BC). Rather, this famous work first published in 1735 AD was the magnum opus of the great Swedish naturalist Carolus Linnaeus (1707- 1778)[1].

It is maintained that the position of Jews in Medieval Europe "cannot be distinguished from modern racial prejudice" (p. 20). Furthermore;

> Jewish persecution clearly illustrates that the idea of race can be socially constructed. The Jews were a cultural group rather than a biologically distinct population (to say nothing of a race) (p. 20).

Rubbish. Don't attempt to sell this to Israeli geneticists, and their co-authors, who have recently published papers emphasizing the genetic unity of diaspora Jewery, and the genetic separateness of Jews from the host populations among whom they live.[15] Graves is correct in his summary that:

> It seems clear that human beings have always noticed and recorded phenotypic differences. Throughout the ancient world humans also speculated about the source of these differences (p.22).

Chapter two deals with the development of race concepts in light of the Age of Discovery with the co-existence of three very different races in the Americas: The European Cacasoid, the sub-Saharan African Negroid, and the American Indian. Graves points out that the Age of Discovery for the first time brought Europeans into extensive contact with different non-European peoples: "Under these new conditions, there are two possible explanations for the origin of ideas of European racial supremacy, one nonracist and the other racist" (p.23).

Graves favors the "racist" explanation which is essentially a rehash of the Marxist-inspired tripe that we are familiar with through the writings of Boas, Diamond, Gould and those of similar ilk. However, his "nonracist" alternative explanation rings true as most consistent with the best of modern science:

> [R]acist ideology developed out of an objective examination of human diversity. If, for example, European scholars had fairly compared the biological and cultural characteristics of Europeans and non-Europeans and found the former superior, racist ideology would have been validated. In other words, if Europeans really did have larger heads and larger brains, and if these features did determine intellectual ability, we could not label a scientist reporting these facts as racist (p. 23).

Yes. Exactly.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The next few chapters (3, 4, & 5) continue the historical development of race concepts before and after the appearance of Darwin's theory of natural selection. Once again shaky scholarship mars the presentation. For example, S. J. Gould's long-ago debunked and thoroughly discredited attack on the honesty of Morton's measures of cranial capacity is presented as though it remains important:

> Stephan Jay Gould's classic 1977 reexamination of Morton's conclusions stands as one of the most important revelations of the fallacy of objectivity in science (p. 46).

The finding from Morton's 1849 measurements, that races differ in cranial volumes with Europeans substantially larger than Africans, is consistent with the best of recent studies.[16] Darwin is presented, through numerous quotes from *The Descent of Man* (1871) as opposing the distinctiveness of geographical races among humans:

> Today, we know that Darwin's intuition about racial variation in humans was essentially correct. … Population genetics allows us to apprehend the fact that there are no biological or geographical races within the modern human species (pp. 70-71).

Conveniently omitted is Darwin's actual summary about the comparison of Europeans and Africans:

> [H]e has diverged into distinct races, or as they may be more fitly called, sub-species. Some of these, such as the Negro and European, are so distinct that, if specimens had been brought to a naturalist without any further information, they would undoubtedly have been considered by him as good and true species (Darwin, 1871/1874, p. 929).[17]

Bio-babble and rubbish finish out these chapters:

> the core error of all social Darwinian thinking results from the inability to separate genetic from environmental sources of variation on the phenotype (p. 81).

Were that the case it would negate all genetic epidemiology, genetic health studies, and the behavior genetics that has revolutionized psychology across the last few decades.

> Capitalism was an advance over feudalism, but it was a stage on the way to socialism and communism, the stages of society that would allow the true expression of the human potential (p. 84).

Eugenics and the early development of human genetics are handled in a similarly cavalier manner. Sir Francis Galton, the great 19th century polymath who founded much of modern statistics and quantitative genetics, as well as psychometrics, is dismissed:



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> Galton's scientific accomplishments are sufficient for some to still consider him an intellectual hero. Whereas for others (this author included) he was an intellectual mediocrity, a sham, and a villain (p. 100).

Chapter 8 (Eugenics, Race, and Fascism—The Road to Auschwitz Went through Cold Spring Harbor) regurgitates the favorite lefty canard of smearing eugenics through *argumentum reducto ad Hitlerium*. Since World War Two there has been an intense and unrelenting propaganda campaign against eugenics that invokes the Nazi smear. However, as Marian van Court has pointed out, in the first half of the 20th century at least 29 countries passed eugenic laws. Included were such paragons of social democracy as Canada, Switzerland, Norway, Denmark, and Sweden. One instance—Nazi Germany—out of 29 countries does not make a trend and does not document a slippery slope. Never in history have peoples felt it necessary to justify their holocausts and genocides by invoking eugenical science. The examples are unfortunately many, including the Bolshevik's elimination of 20 million Christian kulaks and the Hutus' handling of their Tutsi neighbors.[18]

Chapter 10 (The Race and IQ Fallacy) is such off-the-wall rubbish, so out of contact with reality, as to constitute a good example of wall-to-wall bio-babble:

> In the end, the data that the psychometricians rely on to demonstrate racial differences in intelligence are simply the racial differences we already observe (p. 168); even the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) was originally invented to control Jewish entry into higher education (p.158).

Graves points out that to be valid, tests of genetic hypotheses of race differences in intelligence must take environmental differences into account. Of course this is central to all genetic investigation and has been the focus of innovative statistical and experimental designs for more than a century. Even Sir Francis Galton in his earliest works on human variation was concerned about separating the effects of nature from those of nurture[19]. But Graves goes on to claim that experiments which attempt to equalize environments between whites and blacks are not only impossible "under the existing political circumstances but also that the proponents of the link between race and IQ do not argue that the experiment should be performed to test their hypotheses" (p. 172). Statements of this sort are such monumental rubbish as to suggest either a stunning lack of scholarship or intentional deceitfulness. In fact it was for vociferously calling for such experiments that William Shockley got into trouble with the National Academy of Sciences. And furthermore, one variation of the experiment has been done and widely reported:



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When black babies are adopted and raised in educated middle class white homes (the ultimate Head Start), they grow up to perform *not* like their white family members, but rather they still perform intellectually and emotionally like blacks raised in typical black environments.[20]

The concluding two chapters are bizarre. In "The Race and Disease Fallacy", it is argued that the medical community confuses ethnic groups with races: "Ethnicity is defined culturally, whereas the concept of race relies on presumed biological variation" (p.173). And after all, the central message of the book is that biological races simply do not exist. The other main problem is that "all humans have some risk" for various disease conditions, so therefore it is proper to give the same advice and conduct the same tests on everyone.

> The problem is that many biomedical researchers and clinicians are still working under the yoke of the biological race concept. Hence, they see all biological differences between and within populations as potentially due to racial genetic composition. (p.174).

Indeed, this is because biomedical researchers tend to be well-trained rational investigators.

Graves makes the valid point that medical diagnosis and treatment should be aimed at the individual and not at groupings such as races within which there is much variation. Of course this is a valid point and in some more advanced utopian future truly individualized medicine may be a reality. But at the present time we have neither the ability nor the resources to avoid utilizing group probabilities in making medical decisions. Recently, researchers at Johns Hopkins discovered and then developed a test to detect a gene associated with risk of colorectal cancer. The test is laborious and expensive, hence Johns Hopkins announced that the test was available, but only for persons of Ashkenazi Jewish ancestry. Racial prejudice? No, rational decision making; the gene had been found only in the one "ethnic" group. When treating real people in the real world, it would be absurd to test for phenylketonuria among black natives of sub-Saharan Africa, as it is predominately a condition of northern Europeans. Similarly, when confronted with a blood / anemia problem among native Icelanders, any physician that places a high priority on testing for sickle cell anemia should be fired for incompetence. There is a real world and in the real world, so far every one of the genes discovered that predispose to various diseases has not been uniformly distributed among races.[21]

The concluding chapter is a call to action, titled "What Can or Will We Do without Race?" Graves tells us that,



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> Race as most people understand it now was socially constructed … finally, in the early 1990s, [through accumulated biological data] the biological race concept was thoroughly dismantled."… A crucial part of the battle against the legacies of the social construction of race is to get across the messages that biological races do not exist… dictionaries and encyclopedias need to be revised… The United States still suffers from the huge political and economic disparities between those derived from northern European ancestry and those who are not.… the fact that there are no biological races in the United States is not a reason to end programs designed to remedy past discrimination.…We have lived in the nightmare of racism too long…We can change these institutions; we need only to have the political and moral will to do so (Pp. 193-200).

Sound familiar? It should because an almost identical "political and moral" program has been proposed and implemented before. The prior travesty is well described by Valery Soyfer in his book *Lysenko and the Tragedy of Soviet Science.*[22]

---

*Glayde Whitney is professor of psychology and neuroscience at Florida State University, where he teaches behavior genetics and history of science. He is past-president of an international organization, the Behavior Genetics Association.*

---

## ENDNOTES

1. Soyfer, V.N. *Lysenko and the Tragedy of Soviet Science* 1994, New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press.

2. Hyatt, M. *Franz Boas Social Activist: The Dynamics of Ethnicity*. 1990, New York: Greenwood. P.86.

3. Degler, C.N. *In Search of Human Nature: The decline and revival of Darwinism in American Social Thought* 1991, New York: Oxford Univ. Press. P.73.

4. Lindemann, Albert S. *Esau's Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 302-303. See also Kevin MacDonald *Separation And Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism* Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998, p. 36. Lindemann points out, "A parallel concern to Nicholas and his high officials was their belief that a number of powerful Jewish financiers outside of Russia were working ever more openly and effectively to deny the country the financial aid it sought. There was some foundation to that belief: A most tenacious enemy of tsarist Russia was Jacob H. Schiff, the American financier. Schiff played a crucial role not only in denying the Russians the bonds they sought in the international market to finance the [Russo-Japanese] war but also even more decisively in providing financial support for Japan…" For a general biography of Schiff, see Naomi W. Cohen's *Jacob H.*



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

*Schiff: A Study in American Jewish Leadership* Brandeis University Press, 1999, 320pp. Interestingly, Karenna Gore Schiff, ex-vice president Al Gore Jr.'s daughter is married to Andrew Schiff, the great-grandson of Jacob Schiff.

5. *New Scientist,* "Surprise variation found in human genes," 13 July 2001,http://uk.news.yahoo.com/010713/12/by4g6.html

6. Watson, A., "A new breed of high-tech detectives", *Science,* 289, August 11, 2000, pp. 850-854.

7. Shriver, M.D., Smith, M.W., Jin, L., Marcini, A., Akey, J.M., Deka, R., & Ferrell, R.E. "Ethnic-affiliation estimation by use of population-specific DNA markers". *American Journal of Human Genetics, 60,* 1997, Pp. 957-964.

8. Cavalli-Sforza, L.L., Menozzi, P., & Piazza, A. *The History and Geography of Human Genes* 1994, Princeton NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

9. Nei, M., & Roychoudhury, A.K. "Evolutionary relationships of human populations on a global scale." *Molecular & Biological Evolution*, 10, 1993, Pp. 927-943.

10. Hammer M.F., Redd A.J., Wood E.T., Bonner M.R., Jarjanazi H., Karafet T., Santachiara-Benerecetti S., Oppenheim A., Jobling M.A., Jenkins T., Ostrer H., Bonne-Tamir B. "Jewish and Middle Eastern non-Jewish populations share a common pool of Y-chromosome biallelic haplotypes." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science, U.S.A.,* 97(12), 6 June 2000, Pp. 6769-6774.

11. Ingman, M., Kaessmann, H., Pääba, S. & Gyllensten, U. "Mitochondrial genomevariation and the origin of modern humans." *Nature,* 408, 2000, Pp. 708 –713.

12. Jensen, A.R. *The g Factor* 1998, Westport CT: Praeger.

13. Duster, T., Speaker on "Panel Four – Privacy / Ethics Principles in the Creation and Use of DNA Databases." In: Lazar, D.M.J. (Conference chair), *DNA and the Criminal Justice System,* November 19-21, 2000 at Harvard University. Proceedings Pp. 194-207.

14. Mayr, E. *The Growth of Biological Thought.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.

15. Headlined on the cover of *The Jerusalem Report* for May 10, 1999 is the lead article: "Decoding the Priesthood: Genetic science confirms a 3,000-year-old tradition." The story on Pp. 30-35 begins with this lead: "New genetic research shows the vast majority of 'kohanim,' the Jewish priestly class, to be descended from a single ancestor—scientific confirmation of an oral tradition passed down through 3,000 years. Remarkably, the priestly 'gene' has also been found in high incidence among the Lemba, a Black southern African tribe that has long claimed a Jewish heritage." (P.30).; Hammer, M. F., and 11 co-authors, (Communicated to NAS March 15, 2000), "Jewish and Middle Eastern non-Jewish populations share a common pool of Y-chromosome biallelic haplotypes." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA*, published on-line before print at www.pnas.org.]

16. Michael, J. S. A new look at Morton's craniological research. *Current Anthropology*, (1988) 29: 349-354; Rushton, J. P. Race, Intelligence, and the Brain: The errors and omissions of the "revised" edition of S. J. Gould's *The Mismeasure of Man* (1996). *Personality and Individual Differences,* (1997), *23:* 169-180.

17. Darwin, C. (1871/1874). *The Descent of Man, 2nd. Ed.,* London: John Murray.

18. Van Court, M. (1998), Richard Lynn's book: *Dysgenics: Genetic Deterioration in Modern Populations,* A review. *Future Generations* [http://www.eugenics.net].; Whitney, G. (1996), Whatever happened to eugenics? *The Mankind Quarterly, 37,* 203-215.; Whitney, G. (2000), The prospects for an intelligent future. In: Center for Human Evolution, *The Evolution of Human Intelligence.* Bellevue WA: Foundation for the Future, 79-94.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

19. Galton, F. *Hereditary Genius: An inquiry into its laws and consequences.* (1900 revised edition with American preface). New York: D. Appleton, 1869; Plomin, R., DeFries, J.C., McClearn, G.E., & McGuffin, P., *Behavioral Genetics, Fourth Edition.* New York: Worth Publishers, 2000.

20. Pearson, R. *Shockley on Eugenics and Race*: *The application of science to the solution of human problems*, Washington DC: Scott-Townsend, 1992; Whitney, G., Professor Shockley's experiment. *The Mankind Quarterly*, (1996) *37:* 41-60.

21. Laken, S.J. (and 15 co-authors), "Familial colorectal cancer in Ashkenazim due to a hypermutable tract in APC," *Nature Genetics*, (1997) Vol. 17, 1; Hopkins. "Questions and answers about a new gene test for colon cancer among the Ashkenazi Jewish population," Johns Hopkins University news release, 08/25/97; Satel, S. (2001) "Medicine's Race Problem," *Policy Review*, Dec. 2001-Jan. 2002, [http://www.policyreview.org/DEC01/satel_print.html]; Stolberg, S. G., "Jewish concern grows as scientists deepen studies of Ashkenazis genes," *New York Times,* April 22, 1998.

22. Soyfer, V. N. *Lysenko and the Tragedy of Soviet Science* (L. Gruliow & R. Gruliow, Trans.) New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# About the Editors

- **Editor**

Kevin Lamb, a Hoosier native and graduate of Indiana University, with undergraduate degrees in political science and journalism, is the editor of *Race, Genetics and Society: Glayde Whitney on the Scientific and Social Policy Implications of Racial Differences* (2002) and the author of numerous articles that have been published in several periodicals, including *National Review*, *Chronicles*, *The Asian Wall Street Journal*, *Society*, *Mankind Quarterly*, *Conservative Review*, and *The Journal of Social, Political & Economic Studies*, and is a frequent contributor to *The Social Contract* and *Right Now!*

- **Associate Editor & Book Editor**

Samuel Francis, Ph.D., is a graduate of Johns Hopkins University (B.A., 69) and the University of North Carolina (M.A., 71; Ph.D. 79) and former policy analyst with the Heritage Foundation as well as a former U.S. Senate staff member. Formerly an award-winning staff columnist with *The Washington Times*, where he served as editorial writer, 1986-91, and deputy editorial page editor, 1987-91, Dr. Francis writes a nationally syndicated column, is a contributing editor to *Chronicles*, where he writes a monthly column, "Principalities and Powers,"and is currently editor-in-chief of the *Citizens Informer*. He is the author of *The Soviet Strategy of Terror*, Heritage Foundation, 1981; *Power and History: The Political Thought of James Burnham*, University Press of America, 1983; *Beautiful Losers: Essays on the Failure of American Conservatism*, University of Missouri Press, 1993; and *Revolution from the Middle*, Middle American Press, 1996. His writings have appeared in major newspapers and magazines, including *The New York Times*, *USA Today*, *National Review*, and *The Spectator* (London). Dr. Francis also serves on the Board of Editorial Advisors of *Modern Age: A Quarterly Review*.

- **Web Edition Editor**

Louis Andrews is a graduate of the College of Charleston (B.S., 66) and did graduate work in the Department of History at the University of South Carolina. He is a businessman, web developer, and writer and has been published in *Right Now!*, the *Augusta Chronicle*, and the online journal *pinc*, for which he served as book review editor. He is also the developer and webmaster of the Stalking the Wild Taboo website and the author of *North Carolina's Demographic Transformation: The Impact of Race and Immigration* (2004). Though a native of South Carolina, Mr. Andrews has lived in Augusta, Georgia, since 1982.

- **Associate Editor**

Theodore J. O'Keefe studied history and classics at Harvard College. During his career in publishing he has edited several racial-nationalist and historical revisionist periodicals and helped bring numerous books on European and American history and culture into print. Mr. O'Keefe has also published many articles on the political and cultural aspects of our civilization's contemporary crisis.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

**Virginia Abernethy**, Ph.D., emeritus professor of psychiatry Vanderbilt University Medical School, is the author of *Population Politics: The Choices that Shape Our Future* (Insight Books, 1993; Transaction 1999), *Population Pressure and Cultural Adjustment* (Human Sciences Press, 1979) and (editor) *Frontiers in Medical Ethics: Applications in a Medical Setting* (Ballinger, 1980). A former editor of *Population and Environment*, she is the author of numerous articles in professional journals and member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. She is a graduate of Wellesley College (B.A., 1955) and Harvard University (M.A. 1969, Ph.D., 1970).

**Joseph E. Fallon**, author of *Deconstructing America: Immigration, Nationality and Statehood* and a co-editor of the seven-volume history *German-Americans in the World Wars*, is a freelance writer/researcher. He began his Masters Degree program at the American University of Cairo, Egypt and obtained his Masters in International Affairs from Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs.

**Wayne Lutton**, Ph.D., editor of *The Social Contract*, is a policy analyst and historian. He has published widely on population and immigration concerns. Dr. Lutton has been research director for an educational institute and a college professor. He is the author or contributor to many books and monographs including *The Immigration Time Bomb* (revised 1988), and *The Immigration Invasion*. His articles and reviews have appeared in *Chronicles*, *National Review*, *The Social Contract* and other journals of scholarship and opinion.

**Richard Lynn**, Ph.D., professor emeritus of psychology, University of Ulster, Coleraine, Londonderry, Northern Ireland, is the author most recently of *Eugenics: A Reassessment* (Praeger, 2001), *The Science of Human Diversity: A History of the Pioneer Fund* (University Press of America, 2001), and *Dysgenics: Genetic Deterioration in Modern Populations* (Praeger, 1996). Other published writings include: "National IQ and Economic Development: A Study of Eighty-One Developing Nations," (with Tatu Vanhanen) *Mankind Quarterly* (Summer 2001), "Geographical Variation in Intelligence," in *The Scientific Study of Human Nature: Tribute to Hans J. Eysenck at Eighty*, (editor) Helmuth Nyborg (Pergamon, 1997), "The Decline of Genotypic Intelligence," and "In Support of the Nutrition Theory," in *The Rising Curve: Long-Term Gains in IQ and Related Measures*, (editor) Ulric Neisser (APA, 1998). A contributor to various monographs and psychological journals, Dr. Lynn's previous books include: *Educational Achievement in Japan: Lessons for the West* (M.E. Sharpe, 1988), (editor) *Dimensions of Personality: Papers in Honour of H.J. Eysenck* (Pergamon, 1981) and *Personality and National Character* (Pergamon, 1971). He currently serves as an editorial advisor to *Mankind Quarterly*.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**Kevin MacDonald**, Ph.D., professor of psychology, California State University-Long Beach, is the editor of *Population and Environment* and former editor of the *Human Behavior and Evolution Society Newsletter*. He is the author most recently of *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements* (Praeger, 1998), *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism* (Praeger, 1998), and *A People that Shall Dwell Alone: Judaism as a Group Evolutionary Strategy* (Praeger, 1994). As a frequent contributor to monographs and author of numerous articles in evolutionary psychology, religion and ethnic relations, his previous books include: *Sociobiological Perspectives on Human Development* (Springer-Verlag, 1988), *Social and Personality Development: An Evolutionary Synthesis* (Plenum, 1988) and (editor) *Parent-Child Play: Descriptions and Implications* (State University of New York Press, 1993).

**James C. Russell**, Ph.D., is the author of *The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity: A Sociohistorical Approach to Religious Transformation* (Oxford University Press, 1994) and has taught classes at Saint Peter's College, New Jersey.

**Jared Taylor**, editor of *American Renaissance* and president of the New Century Foundation, is a graduate of Yale and of the Paris Institute of Political Studies. He is the author or editor of several books, most recently, *The Real American Dilemma: Race, Immigration, and the Future of America* (New Century Books, 1998) and *Paved With Good Intentions: The Failure of Race Relations in Contemporary America* (Carroll & Graf, 1992).

**Derek Turner**, editor of the London-based conservative quarterly *Right Now!*, is a British journalist and frequent contributor to *Chronicles* and *The Social Contract*.

**Glayde Whitney**, Ph.D., is professor of psychology and neuroscience, Florida State University, where he teaches behavior genetics and history of science. He is past-president of an international organization, the Behavior Genetics Association and is the author of numerous monograph and journal articles. His previous publications include: "The Biological Reality of Race," *American Renaissance* (October 1999), "Diversity in the Human Genome," in *The Real American Dilemma: Race, Immigration and the Future of America* (edited) by Jared Taylor (New Century Books, 1998), "A Contextual History of Behavior Genetics," in *Developmental Behavior Genetics: Neural, Biometrical, and Evolutionary Approaches* (edited) by M.E. Hahn et al (Oxford University Press, 1990) and "On Possible Genetic Bases of Race Differences in Criminality," in *Crime in Biological, Social, and Moral Context* (edited) by Lee Ellis and Harry Hoffman (Praeger, 1990). He is a frequent contributor to *Mankind Quarterly* and *American Renaissance.*



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED